Exhibit B

CEQA REQUIRED FINDINGS FOR THE NIPOMO COMMUNITY PARK MASTER PLAN PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

1.0 Environmental Determination 2

1.1 Procedural Background 2

2.0 Project Description 3

2.1 General Background 3

2.2 Project Description 4

3.0 General Findings 9

3.1 Lead Agency and Responsible Agency Use of the Final EIR and Findings 9

3.2 The Record 9

3.3 Certification of the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Final EIR 10

5.0 Statement Of Overriding Considerations 12

6.0 Findings for Impacts Identified as Less Than Significant 13

7.0 Findings for Impacts Identified as Significant but Mitigable 20

7.1 Aesthetic Resources 20

7.2 Air Quality 28

7.3 Biological Resources 34

7.4 Cultural Resources 46

7.5 Geology, Soils, and Drainage 47

7.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials 49

7.7 Noise 52

7.8 Public Services and Utilities 55

7.9 Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic 57

7.10 Water Resources 57

8.0 Findings for Impacts Identified as Significant and Unavoidable 63

9.0 Cumulative and Growth Inducing Impacts 64

9.1 Cumulative Impacts 64

9.2 Growth-Inducing Impacts 70

10.0 Alternatives 71

10.1 No Project Alternative 71

10.2 Alternative Master Plans 71

10.3 Community Center Alternatives 74

10.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative 75

11.0 Mitigation Monitoring Program 77

Exhibit B

1.0 ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code [PRC] § 21000 et seq.), to evaluate the environmental impacts resulting from the development of the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan (NCPMP or project). The County of San Luis Obispo (County) is the CEQA Lead Agency for the project.

The EIR addresses the potential environmental effects associated with the project. A number of federal, state, and local governmental agencies require an environmental analysis of the proposed project consistent with the requirements of CEQA in order to act on the project. These agencies include the County, the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection/County Fire (CAL FIRE), and the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD).

The findings and recommendations set forth below (Findings) are adopted by the County Board of Supervisors as the County's findings under CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations [CCR] Title 14, § 15000 et seq.) relating to the project. The Findings provide the written analysis and conclusions of this Board regarding the project's environmental impacts, mitigation measures, alternatives to the project, and the overriding considerations, which, in this Board's view, justify approval of the project, despite its environmental effects.

1.1 PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Pursuant to CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the County determined that an EIR would be required for the project. On November 17, 2009, the County issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the EIR which was circulated to responsible agencies and interested groups and individuals for review and comment. A copy of the NOP is included in Appendix B of the NCPMP EIR.

The Draft EIR was available for public review and comment from February 27, 2012, through April 30, 2012, and was filed with the State Office of Planning & Research under State Clearinghouse No. 2009111067.

The County prepared written responses to the comments received during the comment period and included these responses in the Final EIR, which was published by the County on August 10, 2012. Supplemental pages were added to the Final EIR on September 27, 2012, which included additional letters received during the comment period, and inadvertently left out of the August 10, 2012 Final EIR, and responses to those comments. The additional letters did not include substantially new information not previously addressed in the August 10, 2012 Final EIR. The additional pages were submitted to the specific commenters, inserted in publically available copies of the Final EIR (i.e. County Libraries and County copies), published online, and are included in the Board of Supervisors' copies of the Final EIR.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project under consideration in the Program EIR includes the NCPMP. San Luis Obispo County Parks (County Parks) proposes to implement the NCPMP (proposed project), which would result in the phased construction of recreation facilities and related infrastructure over a 20-year timeframe. A description of the project location, project history, and project elements are provided within this chapter in the sections below.

2.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND

2.1.1 Project Location

The project site is located in the unincorporated community of Nipomo, within San Luis Obispo County, California. The proposed project consists of two connected park areas, Nipomo Community Park (NCP), including the Nipomo Native Garden, and Mesa Meadows. The project site is located northwest of the Pomeroy Road / West Tefft Street intersection, approximately one mile west of U.S. Highway 101 (US 101).

NCP is an approximately 137-acre angular parcel bounded by Pomeroy Road and West Tefft Street to the east, Osage Street to the west, and the Tejas Street neighborhood to the south. The approximately 22-acre Mesa Meadows open space area is located within two parcels adjacent to, and immediately southwest of, NCP, on the northwest corner of Mesa Road and Osage Road. The total park and open space area is approximately 159 acres, comprised of four parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers [APNs] 091-313-049, 091-313-050, 092-121-085, and 092-121-086).

2.1.2 Project Background

The park was initially developed in the 1970s, and additional improvements were constructed in the 1980s. The Mesa Meadows open space area was accepted by the County on November 7, 2000. The area within Mesa Meadows was donated in fee to the County as open-space, which limits the County use to passive land uses only. The Mesa Meadows Landscape and Amenity Plan (2002) was approved in association with the residents living in the Mesa Meadows subdivision.

2.1.3 Project Objectives

The primary goal of the NCPMP is to establish the long-range plan for Nipomo Community Park and Mesa Meadows. The objectives of the NCPMP are to:

- provide a range of passive and active facilities and use areas to meet the recreational needs of the community;
- maintain and upgrade existing recreational and community facilities and amenities;
- effectively manage current and projected levels of park uses;
- provide amenities that are aesthetically consistent with the regional character of the area;
- provide a community recreation center within the unincorporated community of Nipomo;
- incorporate infrastructure and circulation improvements to meet existing and estimated future (2025) motor vehicle transportation warrants;

- apply adaptive management strategies, including the use of improved technology, to address new planning and management issues as they arise;
- consider and support active citizen input in the decision-making process; and,
- periodically review and update the NCPMP through a public review process (approximately 15-year intervals), including consideration of the changing needs of the community when evaluating existing and potential new amenities.

2.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project under consideration in the Program EIR includes the proposed NCPMP. The plan includes a variety of recreational opportunities, including the expansion of existing facilities, the addition of new facilities to the park, active recreational uses including multi-use sports fields, passive recreational uses and open space, and improvements to infrastructure.

2.2.1 Existing Facilities

Existing major amenities in the park include: four sports fields accommodating baseball, soccer, and football (5.3 acres), including one lighted field; four lighted tennis courts (0.6 acre); a 0.7-acre dog park; 6,534-square foot playground; group and individual picnic areas (9,433 square feet); the 12-acre Nipomo Native Garden including trails and planted areas; open play area (9.3 acres); 1.1 acres of paved trails/walkways; and, 4.3 acres of dirt and spur trails. Infrastructure within the park includes: 1.2 acres of drainage improvements including basins, two acres of roads; 3.1 acres of parking; 3,155 square feet of restrooms and a maintenance building (consisting of a shop, office and restroom); two host sites (1,284 square feet); and, an air quality monitoring station. In addition, 7,134-square foot Nipomo Library is located within the park, and is accessed from West Tefft Street. An existing, temporary pre-school and fenced outdoor play area occupies approximately 4,050-square feet within the park. The pre-school is proposed to remain until a new pre-school is approved onsite, or elsewhere in the community of Nipomo.

Existing recreation and infrastructure cover approximately 15 acres or approximately 11% of the park. The remaining 130-acre area (including Mesa Meadows) is generally a natural area consisting of oak woodland and coastal scrub, annual and ruderal grassland, and trails. Public recreation at Mesa Meadows includes a roughly one mile Class I bicycle path and contiguous equestrian trail. The site also contains native and non-native vegetation. The trail system at Mesa Meadows connects into the trail system of NCP.

2.2.2 Proposed Facilities

The NCPMP proposes approximately 15.96 acres of new recreational uses within the NCP area, 3.96 acres of new open play area (turf), and 7.57 acres of new infrastructure. Approximately 27.5 acres of existing undeveloped area and dirt trails would be converted to accommodate these new uses (refer to Table 1). The proposed project includes the expansion of the following existing uses: 4,000-square foot expansion of the library near West Tefft Street; an additional 8,276 square feet of playground, including a play structure and open play area near Osage Street and Camino Caballo; 19,000-square foot expansion of the off-leash dog park; an additional 14,400 square feet of tennis courts; and additional three acres of paved and unpaved trails/walkways including a separate equestrian trail; restoration of spur trails; an additional four acres of open play area (turf). In addition, the NCPMP includes an additional 10 acres of multi-use sports fields. The type of sports to be accommodated would

be determined at the time the need for added fields arises. The maximum intensity of use would likely be youth soccer. The area could accommodate about six youth soccer fields. The fields are proposed to be lighted.

Proposed new amenities include a skate park or community pool (10,000 square feet) near West Tefft Street. Additional new facilities would be located near the center of the park, including: a 5,227-square foot amphitheater (gazebo/informal stage); basketball courts (10,000 square feet); handball courts (4,000 square feet); horseshoe pits (1,800 square feet); and, 8,400-square foot swimming pool and deck (if not constructed near West Tefft Street). A paved walkway (11,280 square feet) is proposed along Osage Street. The NCPMP includes a 36,000-square foot community center/gymnasium to be located within the park.

The total area for the proposed community center/gymnasium and associated improvements would be approximately two acres.

Table 1. Master Plan Existing and Proposed Amenities

Facilities	Existing (sf)	Proposed (sf)	Total (sf)
Recreation Area			
Amphitheaters	0	5,227	5,227
Basketball Courts	0	10,000	10,000
Playgrounds	6,534	8,276	14,810
Community Center	0	36,000	36,000
Dog Parks	31,988	19,000	50,988
Group Picnic Areas	9,433	0	9,433
Handball Courts	0	4,000	4,000
Horseshoe Pits	0	1,800	1,800
Skate Park	0	10,000	10,000
Sports Fields (Turf)	231,633	439,520	671,153
Swimming Pool/Deck	0	8,400	8,400
Tennis Courts	26,404	14,400	40,804
Trails/Walkways (paved/unpaved)	50,724	127,373	178,097
Osage Street Walkway (paved)	0	11,280	11,280
Volleyball Court	0	0	0
Subtotal	*356,716*	*695,276*	*1,051,992*
Open Space			
Open Space (undeveloped)	5,689,881	-1,113,510	4,576,371
Open Play Area (Turf)	399,805	172,498	572,303
Trails (dirt)	190,200	-84,276	105,924
Subtotal	*6,279,886*	*-1,025,288*	*5,254,598*

Facilities	Existing (sf)	Proposed (sf)	Total (sf)
Infrastructure			
Basins	54,900	108,900	163,800
Library Building	7,134	4,000	11,134
Parking	137,166 (325 spaces)	183,388 (422 spaces)	320,554 (747 spaces)
Pre-school	4,050 (temporary)	0	4,050 (permanent)
Two Host Sites	1,284	0	1,284
Restrooms/Maintenance Buildings	3,155	1,490	4,645
Roads	89,036	32,234	121,270
Subtotal	*296,725*	*330,012*	*626,737*

2.2.3 Access and Parking

Access

There are two motor vehicle entrances to NCP. One entrance is located on Pomeroy Road, offset and east of Juniper Street. The second motor vehicle entrance is located on West Tefft Street, adjacent to the Nipomo Library, offset and south of Orchard Avenue. Pedestrian, bicyclist, and equestrian trail access into NCP is located off of: Osage Street (near Charro Way), Camino Caballo (near Osage Street), and at the northern terminus of La Serena Way. NCP is accessible from a number of collector and local streets including: Camino Caballo, Mesa Road, Osage Road, and Tejas Place. The trail system within Mesa Meadows is accessible from Charro Way, Tejas Place, and Amigo Place; this trail system connects with the NCP trail system immediately east of the Charro Way and Osage Street intersection.

Major road improvements proposed for the NCPMP include: the re-alignment of existing park entrances on West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road; installation of a traffic signal at the re-aligned Pomeroy Road/Juniper Street intersection; construction of a westbound left turn pocket and an eastbound right turn pocket on Pomeroy Road; and improvements to Osage Road, including road widening for consistency with County road standard A-1(d) (two 11-foot wide travel lanes, with six-foot shoulders on each side, for a total width of 34 feet), and construction of a trail within the road right-of-way. The project includes construction of a six-foot wide, paved, multi-use trail and parallel equestrian trail creating a loop around the park.

The County General Services Agency will coordinate with the County Public Works Department prior to preparation of construction plans for road improvements in order to confirm that road improvements will meet the standards applicable at the time of actual development. In addition, there may be opportunities to incorporate design features that would avoid or minimize ground disturbance, and associated impacts to mature oak trees, drainage infrastructure, and the community. The NCPMP does not include a specific phasing plan because amenities would be constructed as funds are available. The Public Works Department was consulted to assess the appropriate timing for implementation of road improvements. The Public Works Department determined that major road improvements would be required prior to construction and operation of any high-traffic generating facility,

including the permanent pre-school and administration building, sports fields, community center, amphitheater, swimming pool, and skate park (Richard Marshall; March 7, 2006). Proposed uses that would not generate a substantial amount of new trips may be constructed prior to implementation of access and road improvements, such as open turf areas, playgrounds, dog park, handball courts, tennis courts, basketball courts, internal roads, parking areas group picnic areas, trails, restrooms, and stormwater improvements.

Internal Circulation and Parking

Internal vehicular access within the park is provided by a loop road, which connects the West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road park entrances. Additional paved access is provided for the existing ballpark area. An additional paved loop road is proposed to provide access to proposed facilities and parking areas in the center of NCP. The park currently provides 325 parking spaces within several parking lots located within the southeastern portion of the park. The parking area for the Nipomo Native Garden, located adjacent to Osage Street, includes 10 automobile spaces and two bus spaces. The proposed NCPMP includes an additional 386 to 422 spaces, including seven equestrian pull-through spaces (refer to Table 1).

2.2.4 Park Programs and Operational Activities

In addition to the proposed facilities discussed above, the following activities and facilities are proposed as part of the NCPMP: removal of diseased trees and replacement tree planting program; utility infrastructure additions and maintenance; and a cellular communication repeater station. Tree removal would be required to accommodate access improvements at Pomeroy Road and Juniper Street, and Osage Road widening and pathway improvements.

Utility Infrastructure Additions and Maintenance

Water Supply

Water service is currently supplied to NCP through a contractual Water Service Agreement (WSA) executed between the NCSD and the County (recorded May 29, 1984). The WSA states that the NCSD will provide water to the park for the purposes of irrigation, sanitation, and miscellaneous uses. The County proposes to continue receiving water from the NCSD to serve the park, potentially including the use of recycled water.

Wastewater

Wastewater disposal for the park is currently treated by individual septic systems for four existing restroom facilities. The project includes two additional restroom facilities to serve park visitors. Effluent disposal and treatment could be accomplished by two methods: septic tanks and leachfield systems, or fiberglass holding tanks that are regularly pumped and maintained.

Stormwater Management

The project site currently receives stormwater flow from adjacent developed areas, which is directed into existing onsite stormwater basins (1.2 acres). Existing drainage improvements include earthen drainage channels, v-shaped concrete swales, culverts, and unlined infiltration basins. An engineered drainage system is located within Mesa Meadows, including multiple 24-inch corrugated metal culverts designed to convey stormwater runoff from the residential development into four infiltration basins located adjacent to Mesa Road. The proposed project includes the following drainage improvements to manage stormwater flow during rain events: (1) construct a new basin in the center of the southern half of the park, and (2) install a drainage pipe along Pomeroy Road within the existing drainage swale.

Cellular Communication Repeater Station

One repeater station is currently located at NCP on an existing light pole that illuminates the field. A second repeater station was approved by the County in 2009. The second station is located in the same vicinity as the existing station.

2.2.5 Master Plan Implementation

Project Phasing and Funding

The Master Plan does not establish a phasing plan, although the estimated timeframe for completion is 20 years. Once a master park plan is adopted, County Parks staff will go back to the community to determine priorities. The timing, type, and extent of infrastructure extensions, offsite improvements such as traffic signals, and earthwork would depend upon the type, extent, and cost of the first new facilities to be implemented, including associated infrastructure. The overall estimated cost to construct the Master Plan is shown in Appendix A (Master Plan), which is based on conceptual design characteristics. The cost for any particular element could go up or down once the more detailed design is developed. It is possible that the Nipomo community, a concessionaire, and/or a community organization may be a partner in the development of the community recreation buildings planned for the park.

Master Plan Amendment

The Master Plan is intended to guide development of the park to an envisioned "build out" some undetermined years in the future. While the purpose of a Master Plan is to guide decisions over a number of years, it is recognized that as time passes community needs and priorities may change and the Master Plan may need updating and revising. The Master Plan should be updated at 15-year intervals to ensure that it remains viable and relevant as a guide for meeting the park and recreation needs of the community. The Master Plan may be amended at any point along the way if new ideas or pressing needs warrant a change in the Plan. The process for amending the Plan would involve community workshops, South County Advisory Council (SCAC) and County Parks and Recreation Commission input, as well as review and approval by the County Board of Supervisors.

3.0 GENERAL FINDINGS

3.1 CEQA GENERAL FINDINGS

A. The County Board of Supervisors finds that changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project to eliminate or substantially lessen all significant impacts where feasible. These changes or alterations include mitigation measures and project modifications outlined herein and set forth in more detail in the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Final Program EIR.

B. The County Board of Supervisors finds that the project, as approved, includes an appropriate Mitigation Monitoring Program. This mitigation monitoring program ensures that measures that avoid or lessen the significant project impacts, as required by CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, will be implemented as described.

C. Per CEQA Guidelines § 15126.4(a)(1)(B), the proposed project includes performance-based conditions relating to environmental impacts and include requirements to prepare more detailed plans that will further define the mitigation based on the more detailed plans to be submitted as a part of the construction phase. Conditions and mitigation measures contain performance-based standards and therefore avoid the potential for these conditions or measures to be considered deferred mitigation under CEQA.

3.2 LEAD AGENCY AND RESPONSIBLE AGENCY USE OF THE FINAL EIR AND FINDINGS

The County, as the CEQA lead agency, is responsible for administering the preparation of the EIR and certifying the Final EIR. The Board will use the Final EIR as an informational document to assist in the decision-making process, ultimately resulting in the approval, denial, or assignment of conditions to the project.

The CEQA Guidelines authorizes lead agencies (public agencies that have principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project and for implementing CEQA) to approve a project with significant effects if there is no feasible way to lessen or avoid the significant effects and the project's benefits outweigh these effects. Responsible agencies (public agencies other than the lead agency that have responsibility for carrying out or approving a project and for complying with CEQA) have a more limited authority to require changes in the project to lessen or avoid only the effects, either direct or indirect, of that part of the project which the agency will be called on to carry out or approve (PRC § 21104(c), § 21153(c); CEQA Guidelines § 15041(b), §15042).

3.3 THE RECORD

For purposes of CEQA and these Findings, the Record of Proceedings for the proposed project consists of the following documents and other evidence, at a minimum:

- The NOP and all other public notices issued by the County in conjunction with the proposed project;

- The Final EIR for the proposed project which consists of the Draft EIR, the technical appendices, and the Response to Comments including comments and Responses to

Comments that were inadvertently omitted from the August 2012 FEIR, but added to that document September 27, 2012 and provided to the Board of Supervisors;

- The Draft EIR;
- All written comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public review comment period on the Draft EIR;
- All responses to written comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public review and comment period on the Draft EIR;
- All written and verbal public testimony presented during noticed public hearings for the proposed project at which such testimony was taken;
- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program;
- The documents, reports, and technical memoranda included or referenced in the technical appendices of the Final EIR;
- All documents, studies, EIRs, or other materials incorporated by reference in the Draft and Final EIR;
- The Ordinances and Resolutions adopted by the County in connection with the proposed project, and all documents incorporated by reference therein;
- Matters of common knowledge to the County, including but not limited to federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and policy documents;
- Written correspondence submitted to the County in connection with the project;
- All documents, County Staff Reports, County studies, and all written or oral testimony provided to the County in connection with the project;
- The County's Local Coastal Plan, General Plan, and related ordinances;
- All testimony and deliberations received or held in connection with the project; and,
- Any other relevant materials required to be in the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code Section 21167.6(e) (excluding privileged materials).

3.4 CERTIFICATION OF THE NIPOMO COMMUNITY PARK MASTER PLAN FINAL EIR

The County Board of Supervisors makes the following findings with respect to the NCPMP Final EIR:

A. The Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered the documents and other information listed in Section 3.3 above.

B. The Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA.

C. The Board of Supervisors has considered the information contained in the Final EIR, the public comments and responses currently and previously submitted, and the public comments and information presented at the public hearings.

D. All information was considered by the Board of Supervisors before taking an action on the project.

E. The Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the Board of Supervisors, acting as the lead agency for the project.

F. The Board of Supervisors hereby finds and determines that:

1. All significant effects that can be feasibly avoided have been eliminated or substantially lessened as determined through the findings and supporting evidence set forth in Sections 7.0, 8.0, and 9.0.

2. Based on the Final EIR and other documents in the record, specific environmental, economic, social, legal, and other considerations make infeasible other project alternatives identified in the Final EIR, or those Alternatives would not reduce a significant environmental impact, or would fail to fully achieve project objectives.

3. Should development of the NCPMP have the potential to result in adverse environmental impacts that are not anticipated or addressed by the Final EIR, subsequent environmental review shall be required in accordance with CEQA Guidelines § 15162(a).

5.0 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The Final EIR has identified and discussed significant effects that will occur as a result of the proposed project. With the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR, these effects can be mitigated to a level of insignificance. Therefore, no statement of Overriding Consideration is required.

IMPACT ANALYSIS: Impacts of the proposed project and alternatives have been classified using the categories Class I, II, III, and IV as described below:

- **Class I:** Class I impacts are significant and unavoidable. To approve a project resulting in Class I impacts, the CEQA Guidelines require decision makers to make findings and a statement of overriding considerations that discusses as applicable the economic, legal, social, technical and other benefits of the proposed project against the unavoidable environmental risks. The proposed project has not resulted in any Class I impacts.

- **Class II:** Class II impacts are significant but can be mitigated to a level of insignificance by measures identified in the Final EIR and the project description. When approving a project with Class II impacts, the decision-makers must make findings that;

    1. Changes or alternatives to the project have been incorporated that reduce the impacts to a less than significant level, or

    2. That such changes or alternatives are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another governmental agency and not the Lead Agency making the finding, and that such other governmental agency can and should adopt the required project changes or alternatives.

- **Class III:** Class III impacts are adverse but not significant. Mitigation measures may still be required for these impacts as long as there is rough proportionality between the environmental impacts caused by the project and the mitigation measures imposed on the project.

- **Class IV:** Class IV impacts would have a beneficial environmental impact.

6.0 FINDINGS FOR IMPACTS IDENTIFIED AS LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

The findings below are for Class III impacts. Class III impacts are impacts that are adverse, but not significant. Pursuant to Section 15091(a)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the Board of Supervisors finds that each of the following effects have been avoided or will have a less than significant impact, as identified in the FEIR. The less than significant effects (Impacts) are stated fully in the FEIR. The following are brief explanations of the rationale for this finding for each Impact:

A. **Aesthetics (Class III):** No Class III impacts for Aesthetics were identified.

B. **Air Quality (Class III):**

1. **Create or Subject Individuals to Objectionable Odors.** The proposed project does not include any elements what would generate objectionable odors. Use and operation of additional restrooms, standard landscaping and turf management, and use of picnic areas would generate odors typical of existing conditions. This impact is considered less than significant (Class III) and no mitigation is required.

2. **Consistency with SLOAPCD Clean Air Plan.** In the CEQA Air Quality Handbook, the SLOAPCD recommends evaluating consistency with the Clean Air Plan (CAP). As proposed, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Clean Air Plan. The impact would be less than significant (Class III) and no mitigation is required.

C. **Biological Resources (Class III):** No Class III impacts for Biological Resources were identified.

D. **Cultural Resources (Class III):**

CR Impact 2	
In the unlikely event significant archaeological resources are present, implementation of the project may result the disturbance of unknown resources, resulting in a potentially significant impact.	
Mitigation	**CR/mm-4** In the event archeological resources are unearthed or discovered during any construction activities, the following standards apply: a. Construction activities shall cease, and the Department shall be notified so that the extent and location of discovered materials may be recorded by a qualified archaeologist, and disposition of artifacts may be accomplished in accordance with state and federal law. b. In the event archeological resources are found to include human remains, or in any other case when human remains are discovered during construction, the County Coroner shall be notified in addition to the Department so proper disposition may be accomplished.
Findings	The proposed project impact would be *less than significant* (Class III), and is further reduced by identified mitigation.

CR Impact 2	
Supportive Evidence	Based on the negative results of the archaeological surface survey, it is unlikely that significant archeological deposits are present at the site, and there is no evidence that human remains are located within NCP. If such resources are later discovered during future soil disturbance and/or construction activities, the County will issue a stop work order until the resource can be evaluated, and comply with state codes.

E. **Geology, Soils, and Drainage (Class III):**

GSD Impact 1	
Development of the project may expose structures and persons to existing geologic hazards including liquefaction and ground shaking.	
Mitigation	**GSD/mm-1** Prior to initiation of each phase of development for major amenities requiring structural improvements and/or major grading (i.e., sports fields, parking, amphitheater(s), playgrounds, restrooms, pre-school and administration building, gymnasium, recreation center, pool, skate park, and courts), and as required by the County Environmental Coordinator, the General Services Agency shall prepare project-specific geo-technical reports. The reports shall investigate subsurface conditions within areas proposed for structural development and the findings and recommendations shall be incorporated into grading and construction plans, as appropriate.
Findings	The proposed project impact would be *less than significant* (Class III), and is further reduced by identified mitigation.
Supportive Evidence	No significant geologic hazards are present within the project site. Compliance with the UBC and preparation of site-specific geo-technical reports would address any standard issues, including soil stability, ground-shaking, and liquefaction.

F. **Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Class III):**

1. **Fire Hazard Risk.** During preliminary scoping, the proposed project was referred to CAL FIRE for review. CAL FIRE did not identify any significant fire hazard concerns; however, the department recommended preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan for the park, including vegetation fuel management, no smoking areas, and evacuation plan, and noted emergency access and fire hydrant locations (personal communication, Robert Lewin, CAL FIRE; September 27, 2005). Based on the design of the park, proposed access improvements, and compliance with the California Fire Code, fire risk impacts would be *less than significant* (Class III) and no mitigation is necessary.

G. **Land Use (Class III):**

1. **Consistency with Land Use, Policy/Regulation.** As discussed in the EIR (pages 4.7-4 through 4.7-8), potential land use impacts include the generation of noise, light, and glare. Upon implementation and operation of the proposed project, adjacent land uses will notice changes in the NCP, including an increase in noise and lighting. While these changes would affect adjacent land uses, based on resource-specific analysis of these issues and implementation of recommended mitigation, potential land use impacts would be *less than significant* (Class III), and no mitigation is necessary.

H. **Noise (Class III):**

1. **Transportation-Related Noise Generated by NCP Uses.** Due to the relatively low number of expected additional trips (compared to existing conditions), estimated noise level increases due to project generated traffic are expected to be negligible (0.0 to 0.1-dB increase). Since the expected noise level increase would be less than 1 dBA, potential noise impacts related to transportation noise generated by the project would be less than significant (Class III) and no mitigation is necessary.

2. **Increase in Ambient Noise Level.** Implementation of the project would result in a maximum 2-dB increase in the ambient noise level, due to transportation-related noise and activities within recreational areas, including the sports fields and skate park. Ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the proposed sports fields ranges from approximately 40 to 64 dB throughout the day (7:00 am to 7:00 pm). During use of the sports fields, the ambient noise level within 100 feet of the fields would be 54 dB; the noise level is estimated to attenuate to 49 dB at 200 feet from the fields, and to 44 dB at 400 feet from the fields. The ridge of oak woodland is approximately 400 to 500 feet from the edge of the proposed fields. Based on ambient noise measurements, the existing ambient noise level ranges from 43 to 46 dB throughout the oak woodland area. While the ambient noise level would increase in this immediate area, other open space areas within the park and offsite residential areas would not experience a substantial increase in ambient noise levels. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant (Class III), and no mitigation is necessary.

I. **Public Services and Utilities (Class III):**

1. **Fire Protection.** There is an existing need to expand fire services in South County areas. The proposed additional developments at NCP, and resulting increased usage, have the potential for creating an increase in demand on area fire services. However, the proposed project does not establish a new use, but rather involves the enhancement of park and recreation facilities and areas at an existing park location. CAL FIRE did not identify any specific significant fire hazard concerns associated with the project (personal communication, Fire Captain, CAL FIRE; March 17, 2010). CAL FIRE's main concerns regarding access and water for fire suppression would be met through standard County review procedures required prior to new development at the park, including compliance with existing regulations. The addition of new park facilities would place a small additional service demand on the two CAL FIRE stations that serve the area, but new

development in the park is not expected to significantly impact area fire response times or service levels. Thus, impacts on County fire services are considered *less than significant* (Class III), and no mitigation is necessary.

2. **Schools.** Although Nipomo area schools are currently operating at or above their maximum capacities, the proposed project is not expected to result in significant impacts on local schools, because it would serve the existing and projected population. This impact is considered *less than significant* (Class III), and no mitigation is necessary.

3. **Roads.** The proposed Master Plan includes traffic improvements including widening and improvement of Osage Road, the construction of a new traffic signal at the intersection of Pomeroy Road and Juniper Street, and the realignment of park entrances on Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road. These measures would address traffic-related impacts, as discussed in Section 4.10, Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic, and no additional road improvements would be required. This impact is considered *less than significant* (Class III), and no mitigation is necessary.

4. **Solid Wastes.** Cold Canyon, either as it currently exists or as expanded, has sufficient capacity to adequately meet the small increase in solid waste that would be generated by new development at the park. This impact is considered *less than significant* (Class III), and no mitigation is necessary.

5. **Wastewater.** The project facilities are not tied into the public wastewater collection and treatment system; therefore, no increased demand or resulting impacts on that public system are anticipated. Additionally, any new facilities would be required to comply with Title 19 of the County Code to ensure septic system design and capacities are adequate, further reducing the likelihood of impacts. This impact is considered *less than significant* (Class III), and no mitigation is necessary.

6. **Water Services.** The project site would continue to be served by the NCSD for water supply. Improved on-site use of water and infrastructure, including irrigation systems, and anticipated additional water demand is discussed in detail in EIR Section 4.12, Water Resources. Additional infrastructure may include pipelines to transfer recycled water from the Southland Wastewater Treatment Facility. Otherwise, no additional facilities would be required to serve the project. Please refer to Section 4.12, Water Resources, for addition discussion and analysis. This impact is considered *less than significant* (Class III), and no mitigation is necessary.

7. **Energy and Use of Fossil Fuels.** New facilities within the park would require the addition of new electric lines, underground conduits, transformers, and any appurtenances necessary for operation. Sources of energy consumption including interior and exterior lighting, interior heating and cooling, use of maintenance equipment, transfer of water supply, and operation of appliances. PG&E officials have confirmed that they could adequately accommodate the small increase in demand generated by the proposed development that would occur within the park. New gas service laterals would need to be constructed to provide service to proposed facilities such as the Community Center. The Southern California Gas Company officials have indicated that the types of facilities proposed for development within the park would not impact their ability to provide adequate services. As discussed in EIR Section 4.12, Water Resources, and Section 4.13,

Climate Change, the project would incorporate energy-efficiency measures to reduce water consumption (and subsequently energy used to transport water to the site) and use of utility-power and energy. There will be opportunities to include alternative and renewable energy sources (i.e., on-site solar panels) on existing and proposed structures within the park. This impact is considered *less than significant* (Class III), and no mitigation is necessary.

Implementation of the project would result in the generation of additional vehicle trips, which would require the use of fossil fuels. As discussed in Section 4.13, Climate Change, the project provides opportunities to reduce "Vehicle Miles Traveled" by improving access for pedestrians and bicyclists, and includes additional active recreational facilities within the urban core of Nipomo. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant* (Class III), and no additional mitigation is necessary.

J. **Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic (Class III):**

1. **Increase in Traffic and Level of Service.** Detailed LOS calculation sheets are presented in Appendix G in the EIR. Tables 4.10-8 and 4.10-9 (refer to pages 4.10-14 and 4.10-15 in the EIR) show the levels of service under Existing and Existing with Project Conditions for intersections and roadways. The project analysis assumes that the NCP Master Plan infrastructure improvements will be in place at the West Tefft Street/Orchard Avenue and Pomeroy Road/Juniper Street intersections. The study intersections and roadways will operate within acceptable limits (LOS C or better) with buildout of the NCP Master Plan. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant* (Class III), and no mitigation is necessary.

2. **Create Unsafe Conditions.** The NCPMP includes various infrastructure improvements, which will address existing potential hazards related to site access for vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians. These improvements would have a beneficial impact related to safety and road hazards by remediating sub-standard existing conditions. No significant project access impacts are anticipated. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant* (Class III), and no mitigation is necessary.

3. **Parking Capacity and Internal Circulation.** Buildout of the NCPMP will include the construction of numerous internal circulation improvements. New parking lots will be constructed to accommodate parking demands adjacent to the existing and proposed facilities. No significant internal circulation or parking impacts are anticipated. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant* (Class III), and no mitigation is necessary.

4. **Air Traffic.** The project site is not located in close proximity to a public or private airstrip or airport. No features are proposed that would interfere with air traffic. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant* (Class III), and no mitigation is necessary.

K. **Wastewater (Class III):**

1. **Violate Waste Discharge Requirements or Central Coast Basin Plan Criteria.** Implementation of on-site wastewater disposal is subject to updated regulations

regarding wastewater disposal and water quality, including specific requirements for site specific sub-surface investigation and testing. In the event the County cannot demonstrate compliance with the Basin Plan, connection to the NCSD sewer system would be necessary. Based on consultation with the NCSD (personal communication, Bruce Buel; December 17, 2008), the NCSD notes that a connection is possible, based on further review of additional information at the time connection is proposed. There is an existing sewer line along West Tefft Street, adjacent to the park site. Based on review of the Basin Plan, the project appears to be consistent with noted requirements; therefore, this impact would be *less than significant* (Class III) and no mitigation is necessary.

2. **Change the Quality of Surface or Groundwater.** The site demonstrates characteristics (slope, percolation rate, depth to groundwater) suitable for disposal, while avoiding adverse effects to surface or groundwater. In addition, the County is required to comply with the Basin Plan prior to siting and development of the restrooms and associated on-site systems. Therefore, this impact is *less than significant* (Class III) and no mitigation is necessary.

3. **Adversely Affect Community Wastewater Service Provider.** As proposed, the project would not require connection to the NCSD sewer system and Southland WWTF. In the event that site specific testing and analysis shows that the project would not comply with the Basin Plan, connection to the community system may be necessary. Based on review of the Southland WWTF EIR (2011), and consultation with the NCSD, the facility has the capacity to serve the park, if necessary. The project could feasibly connect to the existing sewer system, provided on and offsite infrastructure is provided. Based on review of available information, the project would not result in an adverse effect to the NCSD, regardless of the treatment and disposal method. Information available in the Program EIR could be used to avoid or mitigate impacts associated with additional infrastructure, including avoidance of oak trees and special status species, minimization of soil erosion, avoidance or remediation of potentially hazardous subsurface materials). This impact would be *less than significant* (Class III) and no mitigation is necessary.

L. **Water Resources (Class III):**

1. **Change the Quality of Groundwater.** As discussed in EIR Section 4.11, Wastewater, the project would continue to manage wastewater via on-site septic systems and leach fields, consistent with existing regulations and Basin Plan requirements. Based on compliance with these existing regulations, the project would not adversely affect groundwater quality. This impact is considered *less than significant* (Class III), and no mitigation is necessary.

M. **Climate Change (Class III):**

1. **Generation of GHG Emissions.** GHG emissions directly generated during construction of the project will be a short-term increase. Mitigation is identified to reduce operational emissions for these precursors to ozone, including energy efficiency measures, use of landscaping to minimize energy use for heating and cooling, use of green building materials, and incorporation of engineering and design (i.e., insulation, windows, lighting) to minimize energy demand (AQ/mm-2). In addition, the project includes several actions that would reduce regional

generation of GHG emissions, including improved safe alternative access to the park, including safer pedestrian and bicycle crossings, and improvements to existing public facilities within an urban area. Based on the size and location of the proposed project, this impact would be *less than significant* (Class III), and no mitigation is necessary.

7.0 FINDINGS FOR IMPACTS IDENTIFIED AS SIGNIFICANT BUT MITIGABLE

Pursuant to § 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, the Board of Supervisors finds that, for each of the following significant effects as identified in the Final EIR, changes or alterations (mitigation measures) have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen each of the significant environmental effects as identified in the Final EIR. The significant effects (impacts) and mitigation measures are stated fully in the Final EIR. The following are brief explanations of the rationale for this finding for each impact:

7.1 AESTHETIC RESOURCES

AES Impact 1	
The location and size of the community center and gymnasium would block views of the oak-covered ridge as seen from the main existing park road, resulting in a direct long-term impact to the scenic vista within the park.	
Mitigation	**AES/mm-1** Prior to approval of the final design and development plan, site plans and architectural plans shall be submitted showing the community center and gymnasium a minimum distance of 150 feet from the existing park road.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measure, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	An important public scenic view within the NCP is the oak-covered ridge extending through the northern part of the park, which contributes the rural character of the undeveloped areas within NCP. The ridge can be seen from many viewpoints within the park, as well as from the surrounding neighborhoods, which helps establish a natural scenic backdrop for much of the area. As seen from most of the surrounding community, the project would have little or no effect on views of the ridge from surrounding streets or neighborhoods. Trail improvements on the ridge itself would cause minimal disturbance, and would not be easily visible from the surrounding area due to trail width and surrounding vegetation. The quality of views to the ridge would remain intact and the ridge would continue to provide a visual backdrop for the community. As seen from certain areas near the center of the park, views to the ridge would be partially blocked. The proposed community center, gymnasium, and other structures in this area would partially screen views to the north and of the ridge. Proposed landscaping, such as parking lot trees, would also filter surrounding views. Because of the proximity of the community center and gymnasium buildings to the existing park road, views to the oak-covered ridge to the northwest would be substantially blocked, resulting in an adverse effect on the scenic vista (refer to pages 4.1-17 and 4.1-18 in the EIR). Implementation of identified mitigation would require some adjustment to the proposed parking area in the vicinity of these structures to maintain close parking and access to these facilities, incorporate mitigation related to public safety and crime prevention, and the potential addition of a transit stop; however, the

	proposed development footprint would remain the same. While views within the park would be modified by the proposed development, implementation of this mitigation measure would require that proposed structures are located to maintain scenic views of the oak-covered ridge, as seen from the main park road.

AES Impact 2	
Without definitive design concepts for the elements proposed in the Master Plan, the potential exists for the buildings, support structures, fencing, signage, landscaping, site amenities and miscellaneous features to markedly contrast with the surrounding environment due to inappropriate scale, form, location, materials, colors, and other design factors, resulting in a direct long-term impact to the visual character of the site and surroundings.	
Mitigation	**AES/mm-2** Prior to implementation of the Master Plan, comprehensive design guidelines shall be developed for the NCP. The design guidelines shall be developed in conjunction with community input and shall support the stated goals that park amenities be aesthetically consistent with the rural regional character of the area. For park improvements located along West Tefft Street, the NCP design guidelines shall be compatible with the West Tefft Corridor Design Plan. The design guidelines shall specifically describe architectural styles and forms, types, layouts, materials, colors, and other relevant details relating to all proposed park elements. The design guidelines shall be based in part on the following goals: a. The guidelines shall establish a consistent design theme for the NCP, addressing the proposed elements as well as existing features which may need replaced or refurbished in the future. b. In keeping with the rural aesthetic goals of the community, the design guidelines shall strive for an honest use of materials rather than faux or artificial applications. c. Site design and layout of structures and recreational elements shall be designed to accommodate substantial landscaping for the purpose of reducing the visual dominance of the built elements and blending with the natural setting. d. Site grading shall be minimized to the greatest extent feasible. The location, size, and orientation of structures, recreational features, parking areas, paths, and walkways shall be laid-out to minimize the need for earthwork. e. Buildings and other structures shall use stepped foundations and/or partially buried walls where possible to minimize the need for grading. f. All visible earthwork shall utilize contour grading and slope rounding to achieve a natural appearance. g. The use of visible retaining walls shall be minimized to the greatest extent feasible. Where retaining walls are required, their visibility shall be reduced through the use of materials, color, and planting. Retaining walls may be appropriate in certain circumstances in order

AES Impact 2	
	to protect existing mature trees. h. Paved areas, including parking lots, recreation surfaces, and pedestrian areas shall strive for surface materials and colorings which blend with the natural ground plane to the greatest extent practical considering their intended function. i. The visual prominence of all buildings and structures shall be lessened through the use of architectural form, style, external materials, colors and other appropriate measures. j. All signage shall have a consistent graphic design theme. Thematic variations would be appropriate considering the desired hierarchy of information to be conveyed, such as informational, directional, safety, etc. k. Lighting of signs shall be kept to the minimum required by safety and functional necessity. If lighting of signs is required, the signs shall not be internally illuminated. l. Visibility of proposed and existing wireless communication facilities and equipment shall be reduced by coloring all visible components to blend with the surroundings and by screen planting. m. All proposed overhead utilities shall be placed underground to the greatest extent feasible. Where undergrounding is not feasible, their noticeability shall be minimized by placement in low visibility areas as much as possible. Required overhead utility poles shall be wood or wood-colored metal. n. Existing overhead utilities shall be placed underground as future funding allows. A systematic strategy shall be developed for future utility undergrounding based on aesthetic priorities, opportunities created due to other construction work, maintenance benefits, and funding availability. o. Lighting within the NCP shall be based on the lowest level required by safety and functional needs. Light poles and fixtures shall be consistent with the park's established design theme. Where appropriate, low-height bollard style lighting should be used. Motion detectors should be utilized instead of continuous illumination for security lighting where appropriate and feasible. p. All site amenities and furnishings such as benches, tables, shade structures, drinking fountains, bicycle racks, bollards and road delineators shall be consistent with the park's established design theme. q. Noticeability of required security fencing as well as general functional-area fencing shall be minimized to the greatest extent possible through placement and the use of materials, color, and screen planting as appropriate. Standard un-coated galvanized chain-link fencing shall not be used. Razor-wire and barbed-wire shall not be used. Fencing and railing related to accessibility and safety shall adhere to Americans with Disabilities Act and other legally required ordinances.

AES Impact 2	
	r. Landscaping and other planting shall be used generously throughout the NCP to reduce overall visibility and noticeability of structures, parking lots and parked vehicles, paved surfaces, and to visually blend the built components of the NCP with the natural setting. s. Landscaping shall primarily use native plant material. t. Oak tree planting areas as described in the Master Plan shall be planted as part of the first phase of new park improvements to the greatest extent possible.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measure, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	The NCP occupies one of the more visible locations in the community. The proximity to primary roadways and surrounding neighborhoods greatly increases the potential number of viewers of the proposed project improvements. Because of this large number of viewers and highly visible location, the appearance of the project would have an influence on the visual character of the community. Future development of the site has the potential to substantially alter the existing visual character. As discussed in the EIR (page 4.1-18), *preliminary concept images* of the community center/gymnasium, and a preliminary grading plan for the multi-use sports field and stormwater basins have been provided (refer to EIR Figures 2-7 and 4.1-4). Other specific details and architectural styles regarding the proposed project elements have not yet been determined. Therefore, the EIR analysis considered and provided examples of similar facilities and structures within the County. The EIR (pages 4.1-18 through 4.1-29) provides an assessment of each feature proposed in the NCPMP, and discusses the visibility of each feature, and potential visual incompatibility issues relative to the surrounding area. With implementation of this mitigation measure, impacts due to the project's contrast with the surrounding environment due to visual dominance of built structures related to inappropriate scale, form, location, materials, colors, and other design factors would be considered less than significant.

AES Impact 3	
The monolithic form, architectural style, exterior materials, and colors of the community center and gymnasium would be visually imposing on the site and inconsistent with the rural character goals of the community, resulting in a direct long-term impact to the visual character of the site and surroundings.	
Mitigation	**AES/mm-3** Prior to approval of the final design and development plan for the community center and gymnasium, architectural plans of the community center and gymnasium shall be submitted showing the following: a. All facades should emphasize three-dimensional articulation to

AES Impact 3	
	provide vertical, horizontal, and depth relief. b. The architectural style shall be consistent with the Design Guidelines described in mitigation measure AES/mm-2. c. Roofs should be varied and lessen the buildings' apparent height and mass. d. Roof materials and colors shall complement the building's architectural style. e. Roof-mounted equipment shall be screened to not be visible from public areas at the ground level and areas at higher elevations. f. Building colors and materials shall be visually compatible with the area. **AES/mm-4** Prior to approval of the final design and development plan for the community center and gymnasium, landscape plans shall be submitted for review and approval. The plan shall be developed and signed by a licensed landscape architect and shall include the following: a. Screen planting along the north, south and east sides of the community center and gymnasium buildings. b. Screen planting shall reduce the visual scale of the buildings and visually blend the buildings with the natural setting. c. Planting shall visually screen a minimum of 50% of the community center and gymnasium buildings within seven years after construction.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measures, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	As discussed on pages 4.1-18 and 4.1-19 of the EIR, the proposed 36,000-square foot community center/gymnasium would be located near the center of the park. The conceptual image of the facility shows a 35-foot tall structure occupying a space approximately 250 feet long by 230 feet wide (refer to Figure 2-7, page 2-16 in the EIR). No specific architectural style has been identified at this time, although the conceptual image illustrates one building with a parapet hipped-roof, and one building with a shallow barrel vaulted roof. Exterior materials and colors are not specifically defined. The community center/gymnasium would not be visible from locations outside of the NCP itself. However, because of its size, the proposed community center/gymnasium would be the dominant visual element at the park's core and would greatly define the visual character within the park. The preliminary design of the community center/gymnasium shows generally monolithic structures with little exterior articulation, which would increase the perceived scale of the buildings. If urban or modern-style architecture were used, these dominant buildings would likely not be consistent with the rural aesthetic goals of the community. Exterior details, materials, and color schemes could either support or detract from the desired visual character of the park. As a result, the proposed community center/ gymnasium would have the potential to result in substantial adverse impacts to the visual character of the park. Therefore, mitigation measures,

AES Impact 3	
	including design guidelines and architectural standards are recommended to ensure visual compatibility with the park setting.

AES Impact 4	
Mature trees are primary contributors to the view quality and character of the park. Removal of mature trees in order to construct the elements of the Master Plan would have the potential to be inconsistent with the rural character goals of the community, resulting in a direct long-term impact to the visual character of the site and surroundings.	
Mitigation	**AES/mm-5** Mature trees shall be saved to the greatest extent possible. Tree protection measures shall be implemented which include at a minimum the following: a. All mature trees in the vicinity of development shall be identified on preliminary site plans and final design plans. b. A tree preservation plan shall be prepared to be used as guidance throughout the life of the project. c. Project elements shall be sited to avoid existing trees to the greatest extent feasible. d. Earthwork shall be minimized in the vicinity of existing trees to the greatest extent feasible. e. Tree wells and slope-warping shall be used where appropriate to avoid impacts to root systems.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measure, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	Implementation of the NCPMP would include the removal of mature trees; however, many amenities (such as trails) can be designed to avoid mature vegetation. The recommended mitigation measure encourages protection of mature trees to the maximum extent feasible, which would contribute to the preservation of the existing visual character of NCP.

AES Impact 5	
Nighttime visibility of sports field lighting glare and light trespass would result in a direct long-term impact to the nighttime views in the area.	
Mitigation	**AES/mm-6** Prior to approval of the final design and development plan for the multi-use sports field lighting, a comprehensive multi-use sports field lighting plan shall be submitted for review and approval. The multi-use sports field lighting plan shall be based on a photometric study prepared by

AES Impact 5	
	a qualified engineer who is an active member of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America. The multi-use sports field lighting plan shall be prepared using guidance and best practices endorsed by the International Dark Sky Association. The multi-use sports field lighting plan shall include the following in conjunction with other measures as determined by the illumination engineer: a. The photometric study shall investigate different configurations of pole heights, pole spacing, and other variables which would result in the least amount of light visibility for the neighborhood south of the park. b. The point source of all sports field lighting shall be completely shielded from off-site views. c. Light trespass from sports field lighting shall be minimized by directing light downward and utilizing full cut-off fixtures or shields. d. Lumination from lights shall be the lowest level allowed by public safety standards. e. Any required lighting poles and related fixtures shall have a non-reflective finish. f. The lighting plan shall consider effects on wildlife in the surrounding area.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measure, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	The multi-use sports fields would include field lighting, generally between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. For the purposes of analysis (see page 4.1-33), the EIR assumed that the lighting would be elevated on poles, and that the design would be subject to public safety standards for recreational uses. At night, the sports field lighting could be the most noticeable element of the project for the surrounding community. The neighborhood south of the NCP along Tejas Place would have the greatest visibility of the sports field lighting. Although lighting would be visible, and this impact cannot be entirely avoided, mitigation is recommended to shield all point source lighting from off-site properties and minimize the visibility of light and glare outside of the proposed sports field area.

AES Impact 6	
Apart from the multi-use sports field lighting, visibility of lighting throughout the NCP would affect nighttime views resulting in a direct long-term impact.	
Mitigation	**AES/mm-7** Prior to implementation of the Master Plan, lighting plans shall be submitted for review and approval consistent with the following: a. The point source of all recreational and exterior lighting shall be shielded from off-site views.

AES Impact 6	
	b. All required security lights shall utilize motion detector activation where feasible. c. Light trespass from recreational and exterior lights shall be minimized by directing light downward and utilizing full cut-off fixtures or shields.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measure, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	Safety regulations and guidelines require lighting for parking areas, pedestrian uses, and buildings. Security lighting may be necessary at the community pool, skate park, tennis and basketball courts, and other areas. The proposed lighting has the potential for glare caused by direct visibility of the light sources, light spill-over, and for general atmospheric light pollution. Inappropriate lighting design, including light placement and height, luminaire type, housing, reflectors, lenses and shields could drastically affect the amount of impact within the NCP and to the surrounding community (refer to EIR page 4.1-33). Use of fixtures and shields will direct light towards the intended source and reduce visible glare into the sky and surrounding neighborhoods, and use of motion detectors would eliminate the need for constant lighting within the park. Implementation of these mitigation measures would minimize adverse effects within undeveloped areas of the park and surrounding neighborhoods.

AES Impact 7	
Surface erosion and exposed earth would increase noticeability of earthwork and landform alteration resulting in a direct long-term impact.	
Mitigation	**AES/mm-8** Prior to approval of the final design and development plan, an erosion control and slope revegetation plan shall be submitted for review and approval consistent with the following: a. At a minimum, vegetative erosion control shall be applied to all areas disturbed by construction. b. The outer fringe areas of the multi-use sports fields cut slopes shall be revegetated with dune chaparral to blend with the adjacent natural landcover. c. After plant establishment and/or establishment of erosion control, no or little supplemental irrigation shall be applied to the multi-use sports fields cut and fill slopes. d. Vegetation on the fringe slopes surrounding the multi-use sports fields and the stormwater basins shall not be mowed other than to comply with California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) safety requirements.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measure, the proposed project

AES Impact 7	
	impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	As discussed in the EIR (pages 4.1-34 and 4.1-35), the topography of the NCP is considered a visual resource. The project would alter the topography within the park, mostly in the central and southern portions, near the multi-use sports fields, stormwater basins, and community center/gymnasium areas. In spite of the contour grading, without appropriate vegetative erosion control measures, the new slopes may erode, increasing their noticeability due to scarring and exposed earth. Although the landform of the south-central portion of the NCP would be substantially altered, the topography of the majority of the NCP would not be affected. The wooded ridge through the northern area, and the remainder of the existing improved area would remain intact. In general, the existing topography somewhat limits views from one area of the NCP to another. As a result the proposed grading for the multi-use sports fields would not be readily seen from many parts of the NCP to the north and east. Mitigation is recommended to require revegetation of cut slopes and graded areas with native vegetation, compatible with surrounding habitats. In addition to erosion control measures, these efforts would help to blend the new features into the natural and developed areas of NCP.

7.2 AIR QUALITY

AQ Impact 1	
Earth moving activities for development of the proposed project components would result in the generation of PM_{10} (fugitive dust), resulting in a direct short-term impact.	
Mitigation	**AQ/mm-1** Prior to initiation of construction, the General Services Agency shall ensure that all required PM_{10} measures are shown on applicable grading or construction plans. In addition, the General Services Agency shall designate personnel to insure compliance and monitor the effectiveness of the required dust control measures (as conditions dictate, monitor duties may be necessary on weekends and holidays to insure compliance); the name and telephone number of the designated monitor(s) shall be provided to the SLOAPCD prior to construction. PM_{10} measures shall include: a. Reduce the amount of the disturbed area where possible; b. Use water trucks or sprinkler systems in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency would be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour (mph). Reclaimed (nonpotable) water should be used whenever possible; c. All dirt stock-pile areas should be sprayed daily as needed; d. Permanent dust control measures identified in the approved project

AQ Impact 1	
	revegetation and landscape plans should be implemented as soon as possible following completion of any soil disturbing activities; e. Exposed ground areas that are planned to be reworked at dates greater than one month after initial grading should be sown with a fast-germinating native grass seed and watered until vegetation is established; f. All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation should be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the SLOAPCD; g. All roadways, parking areas, and pathways to be paved should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used; h. Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 mph on any unpaved surface at the construction site; i. All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top of load and top of trailer) in accordance with California Vehicle Code §23114. j. Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto streets, or wash off trucks and equipment leaving the site; k. Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried on to adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers with reclaimed water should be used where feasible; l. The General Services Agency shall designate a person or persons to monitor the fugitive dust emission and enhance the implementation of the measures as necessary to minimize dust complaints, reduce visible emission below 20% opacity, and to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the SLOAPCD Compliance Division prior to the start of any grading, earthwork, or demolition.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measure, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	Implementation of the NCPMP would require grading and construction activities, which would result in the generation of air emissions. Vegetation removal and ground disturbance generates fugitive dust (PM_{10}). Master Plan actions that would result in large areas of disturbance include the sports fields (10 acres), parking areas (4 acres), drainage basins (3 acres), trails and walkways (3 acres), and the community center (1 acre). A screening analysis for the 10 acres of sports fields was conducted to identify if this project component would generate emissions exceeding San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD) thresholds. Construction emissions were calculated using URBEMIS 2007 Version 9.2.4, pursuant to

AQ Impact 1	
	the SLOAPCD CEQA Handbook (2009) (see Table 4.2-6 in the EIR, pages 4.2-11 and 4.2-12). Ten acres of grading would generate approximately 50 lbs/day of fugitive dust. Although the NCPMP would be implemented over a 20-year period, a screening analysis for the entire plan resulted in 120.05 lbs/day of fugitive dust (see Table 4.2-7, page 4.2-12 in the EIR). The SLOAPCD has determined that any grading of 4 acres or more can exceed the 2.5 ton/qtr threshold for PM_{10}. San Luis Obispo County is currently in non-attainment for PM_{10} dust. In addition, sensitive receptors are present in the immediate area, including park users, residents, and occupants of the pre-school and library. Therefore, the generation of PM_{10} would result in a potentially significant impact, which can be mitigated to less than significant by implementation of standard dust control measures.

AQ Impact 2	
Operational and area source emissions resulting from operation of the project at build-out would exceed the SLOAPCD daily ROG and NOx combined threshold under worst-case conditions, resulting in a potentially significant impact.	
Mitigation	**AQ/mm-2** Prior to construction of the community center, ranger residence, restrooms, and swimming pool, the following measures (or similar measures meeting the intent of energy efficiency) shall be incorporated into the building and landscaping plans to the maximum extent feasible: a. Plan for a transit stop and associated amenities (i.e., covered turnout, direct pedestrian access, covered bench, smart signage, route information displays, and lighting); b. Incorporate outdoor electrical outlets to encourage the use of electric appliances and tools. c. Trusses for south-facing portions of roofs shall be designed to handle dead weight loads of standard solar photovoltaic panels. Roof design shall include sufficient south-facing roof surface, based on structures size and use, to accommodate adequate solar panels. For south-facing roof pitches, the closest standard roof pitch to the ideal average solar exposure shall be used. d. Increase the building energy rating by 20% above Title 24 (2011) requirements. Measures used to reach the 20% rating cannot be double counted. e. Plant drought tolerant, native deciduous shade trees along southern exposures of buildings to reduce energy use to cool buildings in summer and allow for solar warming in the winter. Maintain trees for the life of the project. f. Utilize green building materials that are resource efficient, recycled, sustainable, and available locally if feasible.

AQ Impact 2	
	g. Install high efficiency heating and cooling systems. h. Orient building to be aligned north/south to reduce energy used to cool buildings in the summer. i. Design building to include roof overhangs that are sufficient to block the high summer sun, but not the lower winter sun, from penetrating south facing windows. j. Utilize high efficiency gas or solar water heaters, and energy efficient appliances. k. Utilize double paned windows. l. Utilize low energy exterior lighting. m. Utilize low energy efficient interior lighting. n. Utilize low energy traffic signals (i.e., light emitting diode). o. Install door sweeps and weather stripping if more efficient doors and windows are not available. p. Install energy-reducing programmable thermostats. q. Use roofing material with a solar reflectance values meeting the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)/Department of Energy (DOE) Energy Star® rating to reduce summer cooling needs. r. Use native plants that do not require supplemental watering once established and are low ROG emitting. s. Provide and require the use of battery powered or electric landscape and turf maintenance equipment. t. Use clean engine technologies (e.g., alternative fuel, electrification) engines that are not subject to regulations. u. Provide valet bicycle parking at community event centers, as feasible.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measure, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	Operational emissions for the proposed project have been quantified using the URBEMIS version 9.2.4 modeling program per SLOAPCD guidelines (refer to Table 4.2-8, pages 4.2-14 and 4.2-15 in the EIR). The proposed project would exceed the daily ROG+NOx combined threshold under "worse-case scenario" conditions (i.e., all facilities in operation and generating trips); therefore, mitigation measures must be implemented to offset project generated impacts. Based on the SLOAPCD Handbook (December 2009), the amount of onsite standard plus discretionary measures required are based on by how much the project exceeds the identified threshold. Following the guidelines in §3.7 of the Handbook (*Operational Emission Mitigation*), the proposed project would fall within the 35-50 lbs/day range (ROG+NOx), requiring 18 standard onsite mitigation measures to reduce air quality impacts to a level of insignificance. Many of the measures listed in the Handbook are incorporated by nature into the NCPMP, and additional measures are identified in the mitigation measure.

AQ Impact 3	
Grading and construction activities for development of the proposed project components would result in the emission of diesel particulate matter, potentially affecting sensitive receptors, and resulting in an indirect short-term impact.	
Mitigation	**AQ/mm-3** Prior to initiation of construction, the General Services Agency shall ensure that all idling restrictions are shown on applicable grading and construction plans: a. Staging and queuing areas shall not be located within 1,000 feet of offsite sensitive receptors; b. Diesel idling within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors is not permitted (i.e., the operators shall turn the equipment off when there is a break in the work that the equipment is accomplishing); c. Use of alternative fueled equipment is recommended whenever possible; and, d. Signs that specify the no idling requirements must be posted and enforced at the construction site.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measure, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	During construction activities, idling heavy equipment emits diesel particulate matter (DPM), which the SLOAPCD considers toxic, and a potential public health risk. Due to the estimated area of disturbance for both major actions and the total area, grading and construction activities would not exceed DPM emission thresholds identified by the SLOAPCD (refer to Tables 4.2-6 and 4.2-7, page 4.2-12 in the EIR). However, several sensitive receptors are present in the immediate vicinity (1,000 feet of the source), including visitors within the park itself, the day care center, school, and residences. Therefore, the short-term generation of DPM would result in a potentially significant impact, which can be mitigated to less than significant by implementation of standard measures identified by the SLOAPCD. The project would not result in the use, storage, or generation of toxic air pollutants such that an increased cancer risk would affect identified sensitive receptors or the population.

AQ Impact 4	
Demolition and remodeling activities associated with construction of proposed project elements may result in the exposure of ACM, resulting in an indirect short-term impact.	
Mitigation	**AQ/mm-4** Prior to removal or demolition of any buildings or utility pipes, the General Services Agency shall provide evidence they have contacted SLOAPCD to determine: a) what regulatory jurisdictions apply to the proposed demolition, such as the National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants (40 Code of Federal Regulations 61, Subpart M –

AQ Impact 4	
	Asbestos); b) District notification requirements; c) the need for an asbestos survey conducted by Certified Asbestos Inspector; and d) applicable removal and disposal requirements of the asbestos-containing material.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measure, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) considers asbestos to be a hazardous air pollutant. Proper handling of asbestos containing material (ACM) is necessary to avoid or minimize public exposure. Demolition and remodeling activities associated with the proposed project, including removal and relocation of park amenities and infrastructure, may result in the exposure of persons to asbestos containing material, resulting in a potentially significant impact, which can be mitigated to less than significant by implementation of standard measures identified by the SLOAPCD (refer to page 4.2-18 in the EIR).

AQ Impact 5	
Earth moving activities for development of the proposed project components would result in grading activities that may expose naturally occurring asbestos, resulting in an indirect short-term impact.	
Mitigation	**AQ/mm-5** Prior to initiation of construction, the General Services Agency shall: a. Conduct a geologic analysis to ensure the presence/absence of serpentine rock onsite. The geologic analysis shall identify if naturally occurring asbestos is contained within the serpentine rock onsite; and, if found, the applicant must comply with all requirements outlined in the Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measures (ATCM). In addition, the applicants shall work with the SLOAPCD to prepare a SLOAPCD-approved Asbestos Health and Safety Program and an Asbestos Dust Control Plan prior to development plan approval.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measure, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	The project site has been identified as an area that has the potential to contain naturally occurring asbestos. Construction and development of the project could result in an exposure of naturally occurring asbestos due to earthwork, resulting in a potentially significant impact, which can be mitigated to less than significant by implementation of standard measures identified by the SLOAPCD (refer to page 4.2-19 in the EIR).

7.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

BIO Impact 1	
Implementation of the proposed project would directly impact natural communities that provide habitat for special-status plant and wildlife species.	
Mitigation	**BR/mm-1** Prior to all ground-disturbing activities within sensitive areas, a qualified biologist shall provide pre-construction training to all workers involved in site activities. This training shall consist of instruction on special-status species with potential to occur on the property and their habitats. Workers shall be instructed as to appropriate contacts and how to proceed if special-status species are observed on the project site. **BR/mm-2** Prior to site disturbance, the General Services Agency shall prepare a Special-status Plant Mitigation Plan that provides for the propagation, planting, and monitoring of sand mesa manzanita at a 5:1 replacement ratio if it is determined that these specimens cannot be avoided during construction activities. The mitigation plan shall detail methods for transplanting, propagating, planting, and maintaining the special-status plant species that would be impacted. The replant area should be located at the biological mitigation receptor site (5.6 acres). To ensure the success of any planted or transplanted individuals, the mitigation program will include monitoring and reporting guidelines. **BR/mm-3** A biological monitor qualified to capture and move legless lizards and coast horned lizards shall be present during all initial ground-disturbing activities, such as grading, excavation and vegetation removal. Improvements within the existing park infrastructure are not expected to impact these species, however, construction associated with the construction of the proposed field sport, basins, equestrian facilities, trails, picnic, and community center areas shall require a biological monitor. The monitor shall capture and relocate silvery legless lizards and Coast horned lizards disturbed during tree clearance vegetation clearing and initial site grading. In addition, the monitor shall rake loose soil within oak woodlands, coastal scrub and maritime chaparral prior to excavation to find and move legless lizards. Efforts shall focus on relocation of silvery legless lizards and Coast horned lizards to safe habitat outside disturbance areas. **BR/mm-4** Prior to all ground-disturbance within Maritime Chaparral and Oak Woodland Habitat for proposed trail work, the following measures shall be implemented to minimize adverse impacts to Monterey dusky-footed woodrat. Removal of the woodrat nest would result in adverse impacts to the individuals occupying the nests. If future site improvements would impact any of the observed woodrat nests, the applicant shall implement the following minimization measures. a. A County-approved biologist shall assist in the removal of the nest after September 1 and before February 15. Nest removal shall be avoided during the breeding season, to avoid separation of mothers from their young. Under supervision of the biologist, the operators should remove all vegetation and other woodrat shelter within the area that surround the woodrat nest to be removed. b. Upon completion of clearing the adjacent woodrat shelter, the

BIO Impact 1	
	operator should gently nudge the intact nest with equipment or long handled tools. The operators should place their equipment within the previously cleared area and not within undisturbed woodrat shelter area. The objective is to alarm the woodrats so that they evacuate the nest and scatter away from the equipment and into undisturbed habitat. c. Once the woodrats have evacuated the nest, the operator should gently pick up the structure with a front loader and move it to the nearest undisturbed habitat. The objective of moving the structure is to provide the displaced woodrats with a stockpile of material to scavenge while they build a new nest; consequently, jeopardizing the integrity of the structure is not an issue.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measures, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	Construction of the project would result in permanent impacts to plant communities, which provide habitat for special-status plant and animal species, including sand mesa manzanita, silvery legless lizard, coast horned lizard, Monterey dusky-footed woodrat and white-tailed kite. As documented in Table 4.3-3 of the EIR (page 4.3-30), the project would impact approximately 1.22 acres of maritime chaparral, 1.12 acres of oak woodland habitat, 13.14 acres of coastal scrub, 6.7 acres of annual grassland, and 2.94 acres of ruderal habitat. In addition to the biological mitigation site proposed south of Camino Caballo, the County could coordinate with the Nipomo Native Garden to implement habitat restoration within the garden and other natural areas of the NCP (see pages 4.3-28 through 4.3-30 in the EIR). Implementation of preconstruction surveys, construction crew training, and biological monitoring would avoid direct disturbance of special status wildlife to the maximum extent feasible. In the event sand mesa manzanita cannot be avoided, implementation of restoration would occur to mitigate the loss of individual plants.

BR Impact 2	
Construction of proposed trail improvements could potentially result in the loss of approximately 1.22 acres of intact maritime chaparral habitat.	
Mitigation	**BR/mm-5 Prior to implementation of trail improvements,** the General Services Agency shall develop a Habitat Restoration Plan (HRP) for review and approval by the CDFG and the County Environmental Coordinator. The HRP shall be prepared by a qualified biologist and/or botanist and shall detail the methods for restoring or enhancing any areas of maritime chaparral habitat impacted within the NCP. The goal of the HRP shall be to mitigate any temporary or permanent impacts to maritime

BR Impact 2	
	chaparral at the biological mitigation receptor site (5.6 acres). At a minimum, the HRP shall allow for the following mitigation ratios, site protection measures, and monitoring requirements: a. 2:1 restoration ratio for permanent and temporary impacts to intact maritime chaparral (for every one acre of intact maritime chaparral that is temporarily or permanently impacted, the County shall restore or enhance two acres of maritime chaparral at the biological mitigation receptor site (5.6 acres) located within the NCP. b. The HRP shall include a site maintenance schedule, including weed abatement strategies and Best Management Practices. 1. Maintenance shall be conducted bi-monthly for the first three years or until the County Environmental Coordinator determines that further maintenance is not required. The maintenance period will begin immediately upon completion of the mitigation planting, and will continue for a three-year period. At the end of three years, the appropriate regulatory resource agencies will review the monitoring reports, evaluate whether the performance standards have been met, and determine whether the maintenance period will be ended or extended. 2. Water will be supplied to planted materials during the initial planting period. Supplemental water will be supplied on an as needed basis until the Environmental Coordinator determines that the plantings are self-sustaining. 3. Weed control will be necessary to minimize competition from exotic plants. Additional weed abatement will be required during the maintenance period. Weeds shall be removed by hand or through herbicide applications. If herbicide applications are necessary, they will be conducted by an individual holding a valid Qualified Applicators License. Weeding activities will be performed bi-monthly or until the County Environmental Coordinator determines that the plantings are self-sustaining. 4. Removal of trash and litter will occur on a regular basis during the maintenance period. Non-fruiting organic debris created from hand removal of weeds may be left on-site if it will not significantly impact the establishment of native seedlings. However, noxious weed debris will be disposed of off-site to avoid further invasions of the exotic species. 5. Due to the sites proximity to public access, vandalism may be a problem. If vandalism occurs at the site and plants are removed or trampled, the County will replace the vandalized plants and take appropriate actions to prohibit further vandalism. 6. The County Environmental Coordinator will adjust specific replanting requirements if needed, including species, quantities, and schedules. Species selection will be

BR Impact 2	
	consistent with those currently occupying the immediate area and at the direction of the Environmental Coordinator. Any replanted vegetation will be monitored until the County Environmental Coordinator determines that the plantings are self-sustaining. 7. At the discretion of the Environmental Coordinator, a single application of fertilizer may be included with the initial plant installation. Subsequent applications, while not anticipated, are at the discretion of the Environmental Coordinator. c. The HRP shall include clearly defined restoration goals, annual performance standards and final success criteria. 1. In order to accomplish restoration goals and objectives, a monitoring program will provide both quantitative and qualitative data to be used to determine the success of the mitigation and restoration areas. The County Environmental Coordinator will evaluate data indicating the relationship between actual site conditions and the performance criteria. Field monitoring and sampling will be followed by preparation of annual reports that include photo-documentation and evaluation of the success of the mitigation effort based on whether or not the annual performance goals for that year were met. 2. The County's Environmental Coordinator will perform general monitoring site visits bi-monthly during the first three years after planting, and semi-annually for the last two years of the monitoring program (refer to Table 4.3-4). General monitoring visits can be conducted concurrently with maintenance visits. The focus of general monitoring visits is to assess the restoration and mitigation area's need for water or other maintenance related issues. 3. The County Environmental Coordinator will perform biological monitoring data collection annually throughout the five year monitoring program. The focus of the biological monitoring visits is to collect quantitative data that will provide an assessment of the sites vegetative cover and plant growth 4. Annual performance standards have been established to ensure a successful mitigation effort. The performance standards are based on the vegetative structure found on-site prior to construction related disturbances. Table 4.3-4 lists the annual performance standards for growth and survival of planted species that are proposed for the mitigation and restoration areas. d. All restoration activities shall be monitored by a qualified biologist/Environmental Coordinator for a minimum of five years or until the final success criteria are attained. 1. At the end of the five-year monitoring period, the site will be evaluated to determine if the success criteria have been met.

BR Impact 2

If the program is determined to be unsuccessful, the County Environmental Coordinator will recommend appropriate contingency measures. The mitigation site will not be considered successful until CDFG has provided written verification that the final success criteria have been met.

Performance Standards	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Total Percent of Native Cover	20%	25%	30%	40%	50%
Average Vigor Rating (see below)	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,2
Percent of Non-Native Cover (excluding annual grasses)	<60%	<60%	<45%	<25%	<25%
Plant Survival	90%	85%	80%	80%	80%

Notes:

The mitigation site must be self-sustaining (i.e., no maintenance or artificial irrigation) for a minimum of two years to be considered successful.

Plant survivorship may include original plantings, remedial plantings, or volunteers.

Any remedial plantings will be monitored for five years from the date of installation or until the Environmental Coordinator determines that they are self-sustaining.

Plant vigor and survival in the restoration and mitigation area will be monitored annually for five-years following plant installation. A plant is considered "surviving" if at least half of the foliage (or stem if deciduous) is green and flexible. Plant vigor will be measured as follows:

- 1 = excellent – vigorous healthy plant (no necrotic or chlorotic leaves)
- 2 = good – plant healthy with limited signs of vigorous growth
- 3 = adequate – plant healthy with no signs of vigorous growth and some necrosis or other damage present
- 4 = poor – low vitality, or main stem dead but basal sprouts emerging
- 5 = dead – no evidence of recovery

2. Plant survival calculations will be based on the number of

BR Impact 2	
	individual plants installed. Percent survival will be obtained by counting the number of surviving plants and dividing the result by the number of plants installed (initial and remedial installations). 3. Percent cover of native species will be obtained annually throughout the five year monitoring program. Percent cover calculations must be determined by a documented and field proven vegetation monitoring method such as Daubenmire, Braun-Blanquet, line-intercept, or similar. 4. Another important monitoring activity is to detect the presence and advance of invasive plant species, such as introduced pioneer species commonly found in disturbed areas. Russian thistle, perennial mustard, or other non-native species can also invade the restoration areas if left unchecked. Monitoring activities will determine the presence of such species and if action is required to control their advance. 5. All wildlife observed in and around the restoration will be documented as to species, number, and functional use of habitat (i.e., feeding, nesting, etc.). Observations of the general habitat quality will be documented. 6. Permanent photo points will be established throughout the mitigation site to assist in tracking the success of the mitigation program. Permanent photo points will be established during the preparation of the as-built planting plan, and ground view photos will be taken during each monitoring year from the same vantage point. 7. Typically, CDFG requires a mitigation and restoration completion report to be submitted at the end of three years. The applicant is responsible for preparing and submitting the report to CDFG within 30 days of the end of the three year maintenance program. The report must include photo documentation and detail the progression of the revegetation efforts. 8. The annual reports must quantify growth and progress of the restoration plantings to determine if the performance criteria have been met. All three of the required reports must include photographs that document the revegetation progress over time. **BR/mm-6 Prior to implementation of trail improvements**, the General Services Agency shall retain a qualified biologist/botanist to supervise the implementation of the HRP. The qualified biologist/botanist shall supervise site preparation, implementation timing, species utilized, planting installation, maintenance, monitoring, and reporting of the revegetation/restoration efforts. The qualified biologist/botanist shall prepare and submit four annual reports and one final monitoring report to the County for review and approval by the County Environmental Coordinator. The annual and final monitoring reports shall include

BR Impact 2	
	discussions of the restoration activities, project photographs, and an assessment of the restoration efforts attainment of the success criteria.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measures, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	Direct and permanent impacts to various habitats are expected to result from the proposed construction of recreation facilities. Anticipated impacts to habitats are shown in Figure 4.3-1 (page 4.3-3 of the EIR) and quantified in Table 4.3-3 (page 4.3-30 of the EIR). Maritime chaparral is considered a sensitive plant community by CDFG. This plant community covers approximately 14.60 acres within the NCP. The proposed trail work has the potential to impact 1.22 acres of intact maritime chaparral. Disturbance and removal of this habitat type would primarily occur during the expansion and improvement of existing sandy trails. Mitigation, including habitat restoration at a 2:1 ratio, maintenance, and verification monitoring is identified to address this impact and ensure the long-term preservation of maritime chaparral within NCP.

BR Impact 3	
The proposed project would result in the loss of approximately 1.12 acres of oak woodland habitat and approximately 20 mature (greater than 5 inches diameter at breast height), native, coast live oak trees.	
Mitigation	**BR/mm-7** **Prior to site disturbance and grading activities,** the General Services Agency shall submit an Oak Woodland Protection and Restoration Plan to be reviewed and approved by the County Environmental Coordinator. Oak woodland restoration shall be accomplished through one of three options: 1) replanting of oak trees (new trees or seedlings) at the biological mitigation receptor site to compensate for trees removed from the oak woodland; 2) providing for the protection of oak woodland habitat in perpetuity through acquisition or donation of a conservation easement that includes at least 2,000 square feet per tree removed; or 3) providing funds to the California Wildlife Conservation Board to be used for the purchase of Oak Woodland Conservation Easements If Option 1 is selected, it may account for no more than 50% of the required mitigation required for oak woodland impacts and a conservation easement (or similar measure) shall apply. The biological mitigation receptor site is 5.6 acres. **BR/mm-8** The Oak Woodland Protection and Restoration Plan shall include the following: a. For onsite planting and protection purposes, oak trees removed shall be replaced at a minimum 4:1 ratio, and impacted trees shall be replaced at a 2:1 ratio. b. Replacement oak trees shall be from regionally or locally collected

BR Impact 3	
	seed stock grown in vertical tubes or deep one-gallon tree pots. Four-foot diameter shelters shall be placed over each oak tree to protect it from deer and other herbivores, and shall consist of 54-inch tall welded wire cattle panels (or equivalent material) and be staked using T-posts. Wire mesh baskets, at least two feet in diameter and two feet deep, shall be use below ground. Planting during the warmest, driest months (June through September) shall be avoided. The plan shall provide a species-specific planting schedule. If planting occurs outside this time period, a landscape and irrigation plan shall be submitted prior to permit issuance and implemented upon approval by the county. c. Replacement oak trees shall be planted no closer than 20 feet on center and shall average no more than four planted per 2,000 square feet. Trees shall be planted in random and clustered patterns to create a natural appearance. As feasible, replacement trees shall be planted in a natural setting on the north side of and at the canopy/dripline edge of existing mature native oak trees; and on north-facing slopes. Replanting areas shall be either in native topsoil or areas where native topsoil has been reapplied. A seasonally timed maintenance program, which includes regular weeding (hand removal at a minimum of once early fall and once early spring within at least a 3-foot radius from the tree or installation of a staked "weed mat" or weed-free mulch) and a temporary watering program, shall be developed for all oak tree planting areas. A qualified arborist/botanist shall be retained to monitor the acquisition, installation, and maintenance of all oak trees to be replaced. Replacement trees shall be monitored and maintained by a qualified arborist/botanist for at least seven years or until the trees have successfully established as determined by the County Environmental Coordinator. Annual monitoring reports will be prepared by a qualified arborist/botanist and submitted to the County Environmental Coordinator by October 15 each year. **BR/mm-9** To mitigate the balance of the oak woodland impact, one of the following measures, or a combination thereof shall be used: a. Prior to site disturbance and grading activities, the General Services Agency shall record a conservation easement that protects 2000 square feet of existing oak woodland habitat for each tree removed from the oak woodland in perpetuity. The conservation easement shall be controlled by a qualified conservation organization approved by the County Environmental Coordinator. Potential conservation organizations include but are not limited to: The Nature Conservancy, San Luis Obispo Land Conservancy, or the Cambria Land Trust. This mitigation measure may be used to satisfy the mitigation requirement for oak woodland impacts. b. If the County is not able to establish a conservation easement, the applicant shall provide funding to the California Wildlife Conservation Board or other County-approved entity to be used for the purchase

BR Impact 3	
	of Oak Woodland Habitat Conservation Easements (currently established at $970.00 for each tree removed and $485.00 per impacted tree). This mitigation measure may be used to satisfy the mitigation requirement for the oak woodland impact. c. If the County is not able to establish a conservation easement, or provide funding as noted in (b) above, the County may use a grant awarded pursuant to the Oak Woodlands Conservation Act (Article 3.5 [commencing with §1360] of Chapter 4 of Division 2 of the Fish and Game Code) to prepare an oak conservation element for a general plan, an oak protection ordinance, or an oak woodlands management plan, or amendments thereto, that meets the requirements of Senate Bill 1334. **BR/mm-10 Prior to site disturbance and grading activities**, the General Services Agency shall prepare an Oak Tree Inventory, Avoidance, and Protection Plan as outlined herein. The plan shall be reviewed by a County-approved biologist and/or arborist, and shall include the following items: a. Comprehensive Oak Tree Inventory. This shall include the following information: 1. An inventory of all oak trees at least five inches in diameter at breast height within 50 feet of all proposed impact areas. All inventoried trees shall be shown on plans. The species, diameter at breast height, location, and condition of these trees shall be documented in data tables. 2. Identification of trees that will be retained, removed, or impacted. This information shall be shown on plans and cross-referenced to data tables described in item a. 3. The location of proposed structures, utilities, driveways, grading, retaining walls, outbuildings, water and wastewater facilities, and impervious surfaces shall be shown on maps. The applicant shall clearly delineate the building sites/building control lines containing these features on the project plans. b. Oak Tree Avoidance Measures. Grading and development within proposed project shall avoid the removal of oak trees to the maximum extent possible. Such activities shall minimize potential disturbance to oaks and their associated root zones to the maximum extent possible. c. Oak Tree Protection Guidelines. Tree protection guidelines and a root protection zone shall be established and implemented for each tree to be retained that occurs within 50 feet of impact areas. The following guidelines shall be included: 1. A qualified arborist shall determine the critical root zone for each retained tree on a case-by-case basis, based upon tree species, age, and size. This area is generally defined as 1.0 to 1.5 times the distance from the tree base of the average measurement taken from the tree base to the edge of the canopy/dripline. At a minimum, the critical root zone shall be

BR Impact 3	
	the distance from the trunk to the drip line of the tree. 2. All trees to remain within 50 feet of construction or grading activities shall be marked for protection (e.g., with flagging) and their root zone fenced prior to any grading. Grading, utility trenching, compaction of soil, or placement of fill shall be avoided within these fenced areas. If grading in the root zone cannot be avoided, retaining walls shall be constructed to minimize cut and fill impacts. Care shall be taken to avoid surface roots within the top 18 inches of soil. If any roots must be removed or exposed, they shall be cleanly cut and not left exposed above the ground surface. The project arborist shall approve any work within the root protection zone. 3. Unless previously approved by the county, the following activities are not allowed within the root zone of existing or newly planted oak trees: year-round irrigation (no summer watering, unless "establishing" new tree or native compatible plants for up to seven years); grading (includes cutting and filling of material); compaction (e.g., regular use of vehicles); placement of impermeable surfaces (e.g., pavement); disturbance of soil that impacts roots (e.g., tilling). 4. The County shall minimize trimming of oak trees to remain onsite. Removal of larger lower branches should be minimized to: 1) avoid making tree top heavy and more susceptible to "blow-overs," 2) reduce having larger limb cuts that take longer to heal and are much more susceptible to disease and infestation, 3) retain wildlife habitat values associated with the lower branches, 4) retain shade to keep summer temperatures cooler (retains higher soil moisture, greater passive solar potential, provides better conditions for oak seedling volunteers), and 5) retain the natural shape of the tree. The amount of trimming (roots or canopy) done in any one season shall be limited as much as possible to reduce tree stress/shock (10% or less is best, 25% maximum). If trimming is necessary, the applicant shall use a certified arborist when removing limbs. Unless a hazardous or unsafe situation exists, major trimming shall be done only during the summer months.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measures, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	As shown in Figure 4.3-1 (page 4.3-3 of the EIR), oak woodland habitat covers approximately 130.14 acres within the NCP. Construction of ball fields, picnic areas and the widening of Osage Street would result in the loss of approximately 1.25 acres of oak woodland habitat within the NCP. Approximately 20 mature coast live oak trees (greater than 5 inches dbh) could be potentially be impacted or be removed by construction activities. Pursuant to SB 1334, the County requires significant impacts to oak trees

BR Impact 3	
	and oak woodlands to be mitigated. Significant impacts are defined as cutting or removing 10% or more of the oak woodland canopy or removing more than 10 oak trees. County guidelines encourage project modifications to avoid or reduce impacts to oak woodland. If project modifications are not feasible and conversion of oak woodland is unavoidable, the County allows mitigation for oak woodland impacts to be implemented via oak tree replanting and implementation of a conservation easement, or payment of a fee to the Wildlife Conservation Board. Tree replanting can constitute up to 50% of the required mitigation; and all planted trees must be monitored for seven years. As proposed, the project would not avoid individual, mature, native oak trees or oak woodland habitat. Replanting oak trees within NCP, and establishing an onsite conservation easement (or similar mitigation) would minimize potential adverse effects by the creation of oak woodlands onsite and within the native range (see pages 4.3-30 and 4.3-35 through 4.3-39 in the EIR).

BIO Impact 4	
Implementation of project activities in or adjacent to natural plant communities has potential to impact birds by disturbing their nesting behavior.	
Mitigation	**BIO/mm-11 Removal of vegetation and pruning of trees shall be conducted in the fall and winter (between September 1 and February 28)**, if possible, after fledging and before the initiation of avian breeding activities. If construction activities are scheduled to occur during the typical bird nesting season (from March 1 to August 31) a qualified biologist shall be retained to conduct a pre-construction survey (approximately one week prior to construction) to determine presence/absence for tree and ground nesting birds. If no nesting activities are detected within the proposed work area, noise-producing construction activities may proceed and no further mitigation is required. If nesting activity is confirmed during pre-construction nesting surveys or at any time during the monitoring of construction activities, work activities shall be delayed within 300 feet (500 feet if raptors) of active nests until the young birds have fledged and left the nest. In addition, the results of the surveys shall be passed immediately to the CDFG and the County, possibly with recommendations for buffer zone changes, as needed, around individual nests. Tree removal in riparian zones shall be monitored and documented by the biological monitor regardless of time of year. **BIO/mm-12 If tree removal occurs between September 1 and March 1,** within seven days of ground disturbance or tree removal/trimming activities, a survey for wintering raptors shall be conducted. If surveys do not locate wintering raptors, construction activities may be conducted. If wintering raptors are located, construction activities shall observe a 500-foot buffer for the wintering location(s). A pre-construction survey report shall be

BIO Impact 4	
	submitted to the County Environmental Coordinator immediately upon completion of the survey. The report shall detail appropriate fencing or flagging of the buffer zone and make recommendations on additional monitoring requirements.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measure, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	All habitats within NCP provide suitable nesting and foraging habitat for a variety of bird species, including several that are considered sensitive by resource agencies (e.g., Cooper's hawk, sharp-shinned hawk, white-tailed kite). Nesting birds could be directly and/or indirectly impacted by construction activities occurring any time during the typical nesting season (from March 1 to August 30). Tree-nesting birds could have nests directly damaged or destroyed during any tree-removal activities, or their nesting and foraging behaviors could be indirectly affected by noise and other sources of construction related disturbance. Tree removal would be required to accommodate access improvements at Pomeroy Road and Juniper Street, and Osage Road widening and trail/pathway improvements. Ground nesting birds such as Western meadowlark, California towhee, and spotted towhee could have nests directly impacted and behaviors indirectly impacted during any construction activities in maritime chaparral, coastal scrub, and annual grassland within the NCP (see page 4.3-39 in the EIR). Timing of construction activities to avoid nesting birds is recommended; however, in the event other factors require activity during the nesting season, mitigation is recommended to ensure no nests are removed or disturbed, including pre-construction surveys to verify that no nests are present in the affected area. Other, suitable habitat for nests will remain with NCP (see pages 4.3-39 and 4.3-40 in the EIR).

BIO Impact 5	
Implementation of project activities and tree removals has the potential to impact roosting bats, including pallid bat.	
Mitigation	**BR/mm-13 Within two weeks prior to tree removal,** a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey for pallid bat and/or other roosting bats. If bats are not found, tree removal can proceed. If bats are observed, bat exclusion measures shall be instituted prior to disturbance. If maternal bat colonies are found they shall not be disturbed until young bats have left the site. Subsequently bat exclusion measures shall be instituted prior to disturbance.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measure, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).

BIO Impact 5	
Supportive Evidence	Removal of trees has the potential to effect roosting bats and potentially maternal bat colonies. Mitigation is recommended to ensure roosting bats are avoided during grading and construction activities, including preconstruction surveys to verify that no bats are present in the construction area. Suitable habitat would remain within the NCP (see page 4.3-39 and 4.3-40 in the EIR).

7.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

CR Impact 1	
Development within the historic site (CA-SLO-2188H), as defined in the Cultural Resources Investigation (Parker 2002), may result in direct disturbance or looting of a known significant historical site, resulting in a potentially significant impact.	
Mitigation	**CR/mm-1** Prior to construction, the General Services Agency shall submit a monitoring plan, prepared by a subsurface-qualified historical archaeologist, for the review and approval by the Environmental Coordinator. The monitoring plan shall include at a minimum: a. List of personnel involved in the monitoring activities; b. Description of how the monitoring shall occur; c. Description of frequency of monitoring (e.g. full-time, part time, spot checking); d. Description of what resources are expected to be encountered; e. Description of circumstances that would result in the halting of work at the project site (e.g. What is considered "significant" archaeological resources?); f. Description of procedures for halting work on the site and notification procedures; and, g. Description of monitoring reporting procedures. **CR/mm-2** During all ground disturbing construction activities, the General Services Agency shall retain a qualified historical archaeologist (approved by the Environmental Coordinator) to monitor earth disturbing activities within the documented historical site, per the approved monitoring plan. If any significant historical resources are found during monitoring, work shall stop within the immediate vicinity (precise area to be determined by the historical archaeologist in the field) of the resource until such time as the resource can be evaluated by the historical archaeologist or any other appropriate individuals. The historical archaeologist shall be allowed the time and funds necessary to document and retrieve any significant cultural materials that are unearthed. **CR/mm-3** Upon completion of all monitoring/mitigation activities, and prior to final inspection (whichever occurs first), the consulting historical archaeologist shall submit a report to the Environmental Coordinator

CR Impact 1	
	summarizing all monitoring/mitigation activities and confirming that all recommended mitigation measures have been met.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measures, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	Actions within the known boundary of the historic site include the Juniper Street driveway alignment, pay station, and perimeter trail. Grading and construction activities would disturb both fill material and native soils containing historic materials and fragments. The site is not currently listed on the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) or a local register. As discussed in the EIR (refer to pages 4.4-4 and 4.4-5), implementation of the project would not materially alter the physical characteristics of the historic landfill that convey its historical significance to the extent that it would ineligible for inclusion in the CRHR. Mitigation is recommended, including onsite monitoring and documentation of findings, to support the historic record and provide additional information about the resource.

7.5 GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND DRAINAGE

GSD Impact 2	
Ground disturbance activities may result in erosion and down-gradient sedimentation.	
Mitigation	Implement **WAT/mm-1** (incorporate BMPs into drainage plans) and **WAT/mm-2** (prepare and implement SWPPP). **GSD/mm-2** Prior to initiation of construction, the General Services Agency shall prepare a site-specific erosion and sedimentation control plan. The plan shall include measures addressing short-term, construction related effects, and long-term soil stabilization. Grading and construction shall be conducted during the dry season (April through September) if possible. In the event grading occurs during the wet season (October through April), the following measures shall be incorporated into applicable grading and construction plans, and implemented prior to ground disturbance: a. Incorporate the use of silt fences, straw bales, perimeter ditches, water bars, temporary culverts and swales, sediment traps, minimal grading concepts, and similar techniques appropriate for the site. b. Erosion and sediment transport control structures shall be in place prior to the onset of seasonal rains. c. Restoration and re-vegetation of graded areas and unprotected slopes shall be completed as soon as possible following site disturbance.

GSD Impact 2	
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measures, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	Upon development of elements identified in the NCPMP, site preparation will include removal of removal of vegetation, large roots, and other materials. Stabilization of soils and management of drainage is recommended to avoid erosion and sedimentation. Grading activities should be conducted during the dry season (April through September). If grading, vegetation removal, and any site disturbance occur during the rainy season, County Parks has agreed to prepare and implement an erosion and sedimentation control plan including the use of silt fences, straw bales, perimeter ditches, water bars, temporary culverts and swales, sediment traps, minimal grading concepts, and similar techniques appropriate for the site. Preparation and implementation of a site-specific short and long-term erosion and sedimentation control plan would mitigate potential impacts (refer to page 4.5-12 and 4.5-13 in the EIR).

GSD Impact 3	
Permanent improvements, including the creation of additional impervious surfaces, would change existing drainage patterns within the site, potentially increasing the potential for localized flooding during rain events.	
Mitigation	Implement **WAT/mm-3** (BMPs and LID strategies). **GSD/mm-3** Prior to implementation of the first phase of the Master Plan, the General Services Agency shall prepare a stormwater drainage plan in consultation with Public Works, for inclusion in the Master Plan. The plan shall include a schedule for regular maintenance checks, and incorporate additional improvements to existing facilities, including the installation of trash gates on drainage pipes, interception and dissipation of stormwater flow from impervious surfaces, and installation of storm drain inlets and engineered drainage courses.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measures, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	Based on review of the existing drainage system within the park, existing facilities are not adequate to handle existing and future stormwater flows, and localized flooding within the park occurs during storm events. In addition, the existing drainage swale adjacent to Pomeroy Road is subject to erosion, and subsequent sedimentation of the primary retention basin. If this basin becomes inundated with sediment and debris during a major rain event, storm water could back up, flow across the spillway, and discharge into the low-lying areas near the West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road intersection. Additional flooding occurs within the softball field parking lot, and the park access road west of the existing tennis courts. Implementation

GSD Impact 3	
	of the NCPMP would create additional impervious surfaces (e.g., roofs, structures, sidewalks, and paved parking) that would increase the amount of stormwater flow directed towards to lower areas of the park, and increased localized flooding could occur within NCP. The NCPMP includes the following drainage improvements to manage stormwater flow during rain events: 1) construct a new basin in the center of the southern half of the park, and 2) install a drainage pipe along Pomeroy Road within the existing drainage swale. In addition to the drainage improvement measures proposed in the NCPMP, project-specific geo-technical reports shall be required to investigate subsurface conditions within areas proposed for structural development. Incorporation of improvements to existing facilities, including the installation of trash gates on drainage pipes, interception and dissipation of stormwater flow from impervious surfaces, and installation of storm drain inlets and engineered drainage courses is recommended to address existing drainage and flooding issues. Alternative drainage control incorporating BMPs and Low Impact Development (LID) strategies is recommended, including bio-retention filters, vegetated swales, and landscaping within existing infiltration basins. These measures would serve as filtration systems to reduce contaminants and downstream turbidity and sedimentation. Regular maintenance and repair would be required (refer to pages 4.5-13 and 4.5-14 in the EIR).

7.6 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

HM Impact 1	
Use of large equipment in close proximity to the public and sensitive receptors may result in exposure to hazardous materials, including oils and fuel.	
Mitigation	**HM/mm-1** Prior to initiation of construction, the General Services Agency shall ensure that all required BMPs are shown on applicable grading or construction plans. In addition, the General Services Agency shall designate personnel to insure compliance and monitor the effectiveness of the required BMPs, which shall include: a. Prior to construction, staging and refueling areas shall be designated on applicable plans. b. Equipment refueling shall be done in non-sensitive areas at least 100 feet from any residence, school, and library, and such that any spills can be easily and quickly contained and cleaned up. Any necessary remedial work shall be done immediately to avoid surface or ground water contamination. c. Prior to commencement of grading/construction activities, the County shall ensure that a plan is in place for prompt and effective response to any accidental spills. All workers will be informed of the importance of preventing spills and of the appropriate measures to

HM Impact 1	
	take should a spill occur.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measure, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	During construction of elements included in the NCPMP, the use of large equipment would require fuels and oils. In the event of a leak or spill, the subsequent discharge would expose persons to these materials. Implementation of standard BMPs would minimize the potential for accidental exposure. Operation of the project would include the continued use of regulated chemicals, fuels, and oils for the continued operation and maintenance. All materials would be transported, stored, and used according to existing regulations (refer to pages 4.6-7 and 4.6-8 in the EIR).

HM Impact 2	
Disturbance of the former (more recent) dump site along West Tefft Street may result in the disturbance or exposure of non-volatile hazardous materials including metals, long-chain hydrocarbons, or asbestos.	
Mitigation	**HM/mm-2** Prior to initiation of ground disturbance or construction within 400 feet of the edge of West Tefft Street, within the Nipomo Community Park, the General Services Agency shall ensure compliance with the following measures: a. Upon identification of a structure footprint or area of disturbance, exploratory trenches or borings shall be excavated to determine the presence or absence of dumped materials. Samples of the debris and soil shall be collected for laboratory analysis to evaluate whether the materials present any health or environmental concerns. b. Soil gas testing shall be conducted in and around any proposed building footprint to determine whether landfill gas is present, and whether it could accumulate in the finished building. Depending on the results of the soil gas testing, it may be necessary to incorporate design features that will prevent gas accumulation. Measures may include controlling the gas pressure (i.e., passive or active venting to reduce gas concentrations under the structure, venting around the perimeter of the structure, and crawl- space venting); eliminating available entry pathways or leaks (i.e., improving plumbing and caulking to reduce cracks and gaps will reduce entry pathways, install a low-permeability liner around the underground portion of the structure); and, installation of a landfill gas monitoring system. c. Prior to removal or relocation, soil and debris shall be tested for contaminants of potential concern to identify disposal or placement restrictions. Testing shall include analysis for metals, long-chain (semi-volatile) hydrocarbons, and semi-volatile organic compounds.

HM Impact 2	
	Additional testing may be required depending on the specific nature of the materials to be removed from the site.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measure, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	Based on the results of a cultural resources field study (Parker 2002), and consultation with County staff and local residents, a historic dump site exists within the park. The dump was found to contain primarily ceramic, glass, and metal dating from the 1880s to the 1930s. Additional historical research and subsurface investigation was conducted to define the boundary and nature of deposits within the park (site history research and exploratory trenching) (refer to pages 4.6-1, 4.6-2, and Appendix E [Earth Systems Pacific 2011] in the EIR). Two areas of past dumping were identified in the study and field analysis conducted as part of the EIR. The location of the older dump site is not published to prevent excavation and exploration. This site is less than 5 feet in depth, and appears to have not been used after 1939. Observed materials appear to be generally non-organic; therefore, the likelihood of landfill gas is low. The more recent dump site is on the north side of West Tefft Street, approximately 200 feet west of Pomeroy Road, and extends several hundred feet to the southwest, in the vicinity of the existing dog park, picnic area, and unimproved area between the dog park and the library (refer to Appendix E in the EIR). This site contains debris to a depth of at least 8 feet, and appears to have been in operation from 1939 to 1969. Observed materials appear to be generally non-organic, and are unlikely to generate significant amounts of landfill gas. The results of soil gas testing and monitoring near the library indicate that the dump is not generating significant amounts of combustible gases. Field monitoring of the dumps indicate that volatile organic vapors were not present in the trenched areas. Landfill gas monitoring at the site of the existing library did not detect landfill gas. These results and the nature of the encountered debris indicate that volatile organic compounds are not likely to affect proposed development; however, they could contain non-volatile contaminants such as metals, long-chain hydrocarbons, or asbestos that could present a health or disposal concern if they are disturbed. Due to the nature of undocumented dumping, conditions throughout the dump area may not be uniform. Proposed improvements in this area would include the library expansion, skatepark or community pool, access road, and associated parking. Site specific testing would be necessary prior to development of these structures and improvements. Further testing and remediation would be implemented pursuant to existing regulations and in compliance with CalRecycle and state codes, which would adequately address this issue and avoid hazardous material or gas exposure (refer to pages 4.6-8 and 4.6-9 in the EIR).

7.7 NOISE

N Impact 1	
The Nipomo Library and proposed expansion of the library would be adversely affected by transportation-related noise exceeding the County Noise Element interior noise threshold of 45 decibels.	
Mitigation	**N/mm-1** Prior to expansion of the Nipomo Library, the proposed plans shall include the following or similar acoustical design measures to attenuate interior noise by 7 decibels, resulting in a measured interior noise level of 45 decibels or less: a. Air conditioning or a mechanical ventilation system. b. Windows and sliding doors mounted in low air infiltration rate frames (0.5 cfm or less, per American National Standards Institute (ANSI) specifications). c. Solid core exterior doors with perimeter weather stripping and threshold seals. d. Exterior walls consist of stucco or brick veneer. Wood siding with a 0.5-inch minimum thickness fiberboard (soundboard) underlayer may also be used. e. Use of dual paned or soundproof glass for windows facing West Tefft Street (or similar measure). f. Roof or attic vents facing the south, north, and east shall be baffled.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measure, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	The Nipomo Library, a noise sensitive use, is located approximately 110 feet from the West Tefft Street roadway, a source of transportation-related noise. The topography between the library and the road is nearly level and hardscaped (existing parking area). The noise level is approximately 64.5 decibels along this section of West Tefft Street (refer to Table 4.8-1, page 4.8-2 in the EIR). Generally, for this use, noise levels ranging from 60 to 70 dB is considered conditionally acceptable. The library faces West Tefft Street, and there are no outdoor use areas (aside from the parking area) between the building and the roadway. The proposed expansion would be located on the western side of the library, opposite the roadway. Standard building practices would attenuate noise by 15 dB, and the existing library building would further attenuate noise. The threshold of significance of interior noise is 45 dB; therefore, noise mitigation is recommended for both the existing building and southern and northern aspects of the proposed expansion, including replacement of windows, which would attenuate interior noise to acceptable levels (refer to pages 4.8-12 and 4.8-14 in the EIR).

N Impact 2	
Use of the proposed skate park and other activities would generate stationary noise levels exceeding County Noise Element thresholds of significant for noise-sensitive land uses.	
Mitigation	**N/mm-2** Prior to construction of the skate park, the design plans shall incorporate the following noise reduction measures, achieving a maximum average hourly noise level of 65 decibels as measured 25 feet from the edge of the skate park: a. In-ground concrete design to minimize noise generation during use. b. Earthen berm between the skate park and the noise sensitive land uses. c. Fence and lock-able gate surrounding the skate park facility. **N/mm-3** During operation of the park, events and activities shall only be permitted during operating hours (6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.). Mowing, use of equipment, and other maintenance activities shall be limited to daytime hours, unless an emergency situation exists. Noise generated by loudspeakers and microphones shall be directed towards the interior of the park, away from surrounding residential areas. **N/mm-4** In the event substantiated noise complaints are received by the County, and the presence of the onsite ranger and/or park host is not sufficient to address received complaints, County Parks shall develop a park monitor program. The program may include volunteers or paid staff and shall provide for presence during key operations of the skate park to restrict playing of loud music and the use of loud voices. The monitor may be present during operating hours in the summer, and on weekends and afternoons during the winter. To prevent use of the skate park and pool during nighttime hours when the park is closed (10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.), County Parks shall install a fence and locked gate around the skate park or community pool.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measures, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	The primary sources of stationary noise generated by the project would be use of the multi-use sports fields (soccer) and the skate park. To help assess expected stationary noise levels resulting from development due to the project, similar noise sources and events were monitored. Noise was measured on November 19, 2010, at the Damon Garcia Sports Complex (San Luis Obispo, California), during a youth soccer tournament, and at the Templeton Skate Park (Templeton, California) on November 21, 2010. Refers to Appendix F, Table 4.8-9 (page 4.8-14), and Table 4.8-10 (page 4.8-15). Assuming a conservative drop-off rate of 6 dBA per doubling of distance, the nearest sports field would need to be no closer than 200 feet from the sensitive receptor (i.e., residence property line) to meet County exterior noise thresholds. The edge of the sports fields would be 200 feet from the property line of adjacent residences; therefore, use of the fields would not exceed daytime noise exterior thresholds (50 dBA). For a skate park, the

N Impact 2	
	active skating area should be no closer than 400 feet from the nearest receptor location to meet County exterior noise thresholds. This evaluation is based on average conditions, with no loud music playing, and assumes only the sounds from voices and skateboards. As proposed, the skate park would be located within 200 feet of the existing library and proposed library expansion, and approximately 380 feet from Dana Elementary School. A residential development is located approximately 120 to the west across West Tefft Street. Based on traffic noise measurements, the existing transportation noise level is 64.5 dBA, and is expected to increase by 2 dB under build-out conditions (including the project) (refer to pages 4.8-11 through 4.8-13 in the EIR). At a distance of 100 feet, the noise generated by the skate park would be 62.2 dB. The combined noise level is anticipated to increase by 1 dB, for a noise level of approximately 67.5 dB. As noted above, transportation noise mitigation is recommended for the existing library and proposed expansion. Due to existing and expected traffic noise (regardless of the project), noise levels at the property line of residences across West Tefft Street exceed identified noise thresholds. Use of the skate park would add 1 dB to the existing (and future estimated) ambient noise level. Noting that traffic levels fluctuate during the day, there would be periods when noise generated by the skate park exceeds noise generated by traffic on West Tefft Street, which would adversely affect residential land uses. Mitigation is recommended, including measures such as incorporating an in-ground design and a noise barrier or berm between the skate park and noise sensitive uses. Construction of a barrier within 25 feet of the edge of the skate park will reduce the noise level by approximately 5 to 10 dB; which would result in a noise level of approximately 63 to 68 dB at the barrier, and approximately 52 to 57 dB at a distance of 100 feet from the source. Based on this analysis, the project would not generate noise levels significantly exceeding ambient noise levels. The park and associated uses are closed between the hours of 10:00 pm and 6:00 am. In addition, a park ranger will be present onsite during daytime hours and a park host will be present onsite during nighttime hours. In the event of excessive noise, the public has the opportunity to contact the ranger, park host, and/or County Parks. Pursuant to County policy, the County would review the complaints and implement remediation. Potential remediation options include implementation of a park monitor program, including the presence of volunteers or paid staff during key operations of the skate park and pool facilities to restrict playing of loud music and use of loud voices. A fence and locked gate, or similar measures, around the skate park and pool will be constructed to prevent nighttime use. Additional sources of noise within NCP include the use of maintenance equipment, such as turf mowers, and amplified noise (i.e., loud speakers, microphones, and music). Existing policies in place to control and monitor amplified noise would apply to future uses within the park. The County

N Impact 2	
	reserves the right to revoke amplified sound permits at any time if the noise level is excessive. In addition, noise generated by loudspeakers and microphones shall be directed towards the interior of the park, away from surrounding residential areas (refer to pages 4.8-14 through 4.8-17 in the EIR). Operation of new uses within NCP would increase the noise levels both within and surrounding the park. Implementation of recommended mitigation would reduce anticipated noise levels to a level below identified County thresholds; however, persons within and adjacent to NCP may experience noise levels above current levels during higher levels of use (i.e. sports field tournaments, summertime use of skate park). In the event excessive noise affects adjacent land uses, and complaints are received by the County, remediation may include a monitoring program to further address noise issues.

7.8 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

PSU Impact 1	
Development and increased usage of proposed park facilities may result in increased demands on Sheriff's Department services, resulting in a potentially significant impact.	
Mitigation	**PSU/mm-1** While in the planning stages for development of any facility proposed in the Park Master Plan, and prior to any site disturbance activities related to development of such facilities, the General Services Agency shall coordinate with the Sheriff's Department for implementation of design strategies and safety measures to prevent and reduce crime, including "Crime Prevention through Environmental Design" standards and "Lighting and Lighting Systems" guidelines, including the following: a. After-hours access points to the park and community center should be protected with adequate security. As admission is necessary for emergency personnel, combinations to locks/lockboxes should be provided to Sheriff's Department Dispatch; b. Visible signage with hours of operation and any type of regulations should be strategically placed throughout the park, and properly maintained; c. Proper illumination should be provided inside structures, exterior doors, designated parking areas, entry and walkways to deter property crime and provide increased personal safety. Lights should be on timers, and a manual overrides should be available in case of a greater need for light. Proper care should be taken to ensure exterior lighting is properly shielded to prevent illumination that would affect the ambient level of light in the nighttime sky; d. County Parks shall provide the Sheriff's Department with accurate

PSU Impact 1	
	information indicating what park employees have access to which areas of any structures or access points; e. During construction periods of any significant proposed park facility or amenity, the construction site shall be temporarily fenced off, with signage indicating that the area is off limits to the general public; f. All construction equipment shall be secured at the site after hours, with a complete recorded inventory kept on file; g. Adequate lighting of the construction areas shall be implemented; h. Special care should be taken to avoid creating "hiding places" in alcoves or entry areas; i. Facility design should facilitate a clear view of the exterior of structures from the interior, and vice versa, to allow increased observation of any suspicious activity in either location; j. Sufficient lighting should be installed on the exterior and interior of any structures; and, k. All exterior doors should meet all safety requirements, should be solid core, and have adequate locks.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measure, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	There is presently a need to expand police services in the South County area, and this need will increase as the population grows. New park development would place additional service demands on existing South County Sheriff services. Current average response times generally range from five to thirty minutes. The cumulative development and build-out of the Nipomo area, including through implementation of the proposed NCP Master Plan, will likely impact the Sheriff Department's capacity to respond to emergency calls (refer to page 4.9-8 in the EIR). Based on the 2010 Crime Rate Index for Nipomo, the index for all crime is lower than the state and federal average crime risk. The index score for an area is compared to the national average (100 index score); the total index score for Nipomo is 13, compared to California, which is 97 (CLRChoice, Inc.; 2010). The number of offenses known to law enforcement, documented within the county in 2010, is presented in Table 4.6-1 (refer to pages 4.6-3 and 4.6-4 in the EIR). The Sheriff's Department recommended implementation of several safety measures in conjunction with development of additional park facilities, including the "Crime Prevention through Environmental Design" and lighting and lighting system guidelines, which have been proven to prevent and reduce crime. Though new park development would place additional service demands on existing South County Sheriff services, through implementation of these measures, it is not anticipated that existing levels of service would significantly degrade as a result of new development at the park (refer to pages 4.9-7 through 4.9-9 in the EIR).

7.9 TRANSPORTATION, CIRCULATION, AND TRAFFIC

TR Impact 1	
Inadequate transit service is available to serve NCP, which is potentially inconsistent with alternative transportation goals.	
Mitigation	**TR/mm-1** Upon implementation of the NCP Master Plan, the General Services Agency shall coordinate with the Regional Transportation Authority, and establish a transit stop within Nipomo Community Park, if appropriate.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measure, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	Buildout of the uses included in the NCP Master Plan has a potential to increase local demands for transit service. As discussed under existing conditions, South County Area Transit (RTA) currently provides limited service to Nipomo. The nearest transit stop is located on West Tefft Street near Carillo Street, approximately 1 mile from the NCP. Currently, there are not adequate paved pedestrian facilities to access the transit stops on West Tefft Street. Therefore, existing transit services are not adequate to serve NCP. Improved pedestrian and bicycling access and connections identified in the NCPMP, and incorporation of transit service to and from NCP would reduce potential vehicle trips contributing to the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange, and would be consistent with alternative transportation goals (refer to page 4.10-16 in the EIR).

7.10 WATER RESOURCES

WAT Impact 1	
The project would include construction activities that would require substantial areas of ground disturbance and use of heavy equipment, which may result in the discharge of sediment and other pollutants, indirectly affecting surface and ground water quality.	
Mitigation	**WAT/mm-1** During any project resulting in ground disturbance, the General Services Agency shall ensure that BMPs are included on all grading and construction plans, and implemented during grading and construction activities as suggested by the County LUO. BMPs shall include, but not be limited to, the following: a. Staking or flagging of grading footprint to minimize the area of disturbance; b. Designation of staging areas, including equipment and materials storage; c. Fueling of major equipment shall not occur on-site due to nearby sensitive receptors; d. Erosion control barriers shall be applied, such as silt fences, hay

WAT Impact 1	
	bales, drain inlet protection, and gravel bags; e. Existing vegetation shall be preserved to the maximum extent feasible; f. Disturbed areas shall be stabilized with vegetation or hard surface treatments upon completion of construction in any specific area. g. All inactive disturbed soil areas are required to be stabilized with both sediment and temporary erosion control prior to the onset of the rainy season (October 15 to April 15). **WAT/mm-2** Prior to major grading (ground disturbance exceeding one acre), the General Services Agency shall prepare and submit a SWPPP to the RWQCB for review and approval. A copy of the plan shall be on-site during all major grading and construction activities.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measures, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	Due to the location of the project, implementation of the project would not result in direct effects to surface or groundwater. Future grading activities would disturb soil, and potentially result in off-site sedimentation and/or clogging within existing and proposed retention basins. Standard erosion and sedimentation control measures would be required, including staking or flagging the development footprint; use of fiber rolls and silt fencing to retain soil on-site; covering soil stockpiles; and restoration and revegetation of disturbed soils. In addition to implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) described above, implementation of these measures would ensure avoidance of adverse effects to water quality (refer to pages 4.12-11 and 4.12-12 in the EIR).

WAT Impact 2	
During operation of the project, discharge of sediment, hydrocarbons, and other pollutants into stormwater and drainage infrastructure would indirectly affect water quality.	
Mitigation	**WAT/mm-3** Prior to construction of drainage infrastructure, the General Services Agency, in consultation with Public Works, shall prepare drainage plans incorporating BMPs and LID strategies suggested by the County LUO to minimize stormwater flow rates and off-site transport of pollutants, including sediment, hydrocarbons, and equestrian waste. BMPs may include, but not be limited to: a. Minimize parking area by incorporating striped and painted “compact-vehicle” spaces. b. Incorporate grassed swales in lieu of paved curbs and gutters. c. Incorporate the use of alternative pavers, including gravel, cobbles, wood mulch, brick, grass pavers, turf blocks, natural stone, pervious concrete, and porous asphalt.

WAT Impact 2	
	d. Construct bio-retention areas (or raingardens) near parking areas and access roads. e. Incorporate the use of swales to convey stormwater into retention basins (i.e., grassed channel, dry swale, wet swale, biofilter, or bioswale). f. Incorporate the use of infiltration basins in lieu of conventional retention basins. g. Install cisterns or rainbarrels near structures (i.e., library, community center, restrooms) to collect and filter stormwater from roofs and gutters and re-use for nearby landscaping.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measure, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	During operation of the project, discharge of sediment, hydrocarbons, and other pollutants into stormwater and drainage infrastructure (which eventually discharge into surface waters) would indirectly affect water quality. Increased vehicle use and parking onsite and the creation of additional impervious surfaces creates the potential for pollutant transport and increased stormwater flow rates. Proper planning and implementation of best management practices (BMPs) and low impact development (LID) strategies reduces the potential for off-site transport of pollutants that may affect surface and ground water quality, either directly or indirectly (refer to pages 4.12-11 and 4.12-12 in the EIR).

WAT Impact 3	
Implementation of the project would create additional areas of impervious surfaces, potentially affecting off-site stormwater flow rates.	
Mitigation	Implement **WAT/mm-3**.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measure, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	The proposed project would result in approximately 7.5 acres of additional impervious surfaces, including approximately 2.5 acres of facilities and 5 acres for infrastructure. The remaining additional acreage would include pervious surfaces, such as trails and sports fields. On-site stormwater management is proposed to avoid adverse effects both within the NCP and off-site. While these elements do not represent a significant percentage of area compared to permeable surfaces within the park, incorporation of LID strategies is recommended to avoid potential effects to stormwater flow and off-site effects related to flood control and stormwater management. The creation of additional impervious surfaces creates the potential for increased stormwater flow rates. Proper planning and implementation of

WAT Impact 3	
	BMPs and LID strategies reduces the potential uncontrolled drainage and increased flow resulting in erosion, flooding, and other adverse drainage impacts (refer to page 4.12-14 in the EIR).

WAT Impact 4	
Implementation of the project would create additional demand for water services from the NCSD.	
Mitigation	**WAT/mm-4** Prior to expansion or addition of irrigated turf and landscaped areas, the General Services Agency shall conduct a water survey of existing irrigated turf and landscaped areas, in consultation with the NCSD, that shall include, but not be limited to, the following: a. Quantify irrigated areas based on vegetation type (i.e., turf, ornamental landscaping, trees). b. Inspect and inventory the irrigation system, including timers, distribution lines, storage, and other infrastructure, and document needed maintenance and repairs. c. Develop irrigation schedule by month, based on precipitation rate and local climate. d. Document irrigation system performance and landscape conditions. e. Review irrigation schedule. f. Summarize water survey evaluation results and identify water savings recommendations, which shall achieve a minimum 50% reduction in current water use. **WAT/mm-5** Prior to expansion or addition of irrigated turf and landscaped areas, the General Services Agency shall demonstrate compliance with the water survey evaluation water savings recommendations, and shall submit documentation to the NCSD for verification. Water savings recommendations shall be applied to existing and additional irrigated turf and landscaped areas, and may include, but not be limited to the following: a. Computerized irrigation controller that can estimate cumulative evapo-transpiration losses to establish the most efficient and effective watering regimes. b. Avoidance of close mowing, overwatering, excessive fertilization, soil compaction and accumulation of thatch. c. Programming watering times for longer and less frequently rather than for short periods and more frequently. d. Installation of tensionmeters at different depths to measure moisture status, which will allow for better estimates on irrigation needs. e. Linking irrigation of the park to the California Irrigation Management Information System (CIMIS) station located at the Woodlands golf course to maximize irrigation efficiency.

WAT Impact 4	
	f. Implementation and maintenance of the most efficient and effective water regime for park irrigation consistent with best management practices, such as measures identified by the California Urban Water Conservation Council and/or similar recognized organizations. g. Incorporation of recycled water from the Southland WWTF. h. Consultation with NCSD prior to implementation of major planned replacement, renovation, or construction of water-using facilities. **WAT/mm-6** Prior to construction of additional restrooms, the General Services Agency shall retrofit existing toilets and sinks with low-flow appliances within the NCP. All new appliances shall be low-flow (1.6 gallons per flush).
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measures, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	Water demand was estimated through the use of water duty factors derived from several sources including the County of Santa Barbara and Monterey County. Water demand for irrigated turf ranges from 1.6 to 2.7 acre feet per year (afy). The 2.7 afy rate identified by the County of Santa Barbara for the community of Orcutt was applied to this project, due to similar annual average rainfall (approximately 16 inches/year). The total additional water demand would be approximately 44.3 afy (refer to Table 4.12-2, page 4.12-10 in the EIR). The proposed NCP Master Plan would be constructed in phases, and supplemental water would need to be secured prior to construction of the new sports fields and open public turf areas. Based on implementation of the Urban Water Management Plan (NCSD 2011), including water conservation measures and site-specific retrofits, maintenance, and monitoring of water use, the NCSD has demonstrated adequate water supply to serve the future needs of the park. As noted by the NCSD, this additional service is contingent on the implementation of improvements to the existing irrigation system to reduce current water supply, consistent with measures to target reducing consumption for high-use customers. Implementation of the project would create additional demand for water supply from the NCSD. The highest water demand would consist of additional turf; however, this use would be public, and annual consumption is monitored by the County and NCSD. Water conservation measures are identified for both current and future uses and advancements in conservation technology and recycled water infrastructure can be accommodated to further reduce water consumption, which would reduce existing water demand by 50 percent. As noted in Table 4.12 1 (page 4.12-10 in the EIR), the average annual water demand over the past 12 years is approximately 48 afy (excluding year 2009 when a meter failed). Application of these mitigation measures would result in a 24 afy reduction in water use for existing uses, and a 22 afy reduction in future anticipated water demand. Based on implementation of identified water conservation

WAT Impact 4	
	measures, the total anticipated demand would be approximately 46 afy (no net demand for additional water) (refer to pages 4.12-14 through 4.12-16 in the EIR). Therefore, impacts would be mitigated to less than significant.

8.0 FINDINGS FOR IMPACTS IDENTIFIED AS SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE

No significant and unavoidable impacts (Class I) were identified for the proposed project.

9.0 CUMULATIVE AND GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS

9.1 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

State CEQA *Guidelines* § 15355 defines cumulative impacts as

> *"two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts". Further, "the cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time."*

The Guidelines require the discussion of cumulative impacts to reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence. However, the discussion need not be as detailed as the analysis of impacts associated with the project, and should be guided by the rule of reason. Cumulative impacts associated with this project are discussed in the topical analysis sections provided in Chapter 4 of the Final EIR.

9.1.1 Aesthetic Resources

AES Impact 8	
The potential exists that the collective visibility of all of the proposed project elements would substantially contrast with the surrounding environment due to inappropriate scale, form, location, materials, colors, and other design factors, resulting in a direct long-term cumulative impact to the visual environment.	
Mitigation	Implement **AES/mm-1 through AES/mm-8**.
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measure, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	As discussed on page 4.1-36 of the EIR, Nipomo has undergone a certain amount of visual change within the last several years due to new and reconstructed residential and commercial development. These changes have resulted in a moderately increased built-character throughout the community and along West Tefft Street. Implementation of the NCPMP would result in several visual changes as seen from the surrounding community. The proposed community pool/skate park along West Tefft Street would represent the most noticeable change. Without the application of appropriate design principles, these improvements would be in conflict with community goals. However with implementation of identified mitigation measures, the proposed park features along West Tefft Street would be consistent with the emerging aesthetic of the area and would likely appear as an appropriate use for the site. The other park features visible from the surrounding area such as paths, the interpretive center, and playground would also look like suitable park elements, with incorporation of mitigation measures.

AES Impact 8	
	Little new development has occurred within the NCP itself over the last several years, and the visual conditions internal to the NCP and as seen from areas surrounding the NCP are substantially the same as they have been for years. Substantial visual alterations would occur to the central and southern portions of the park. The most intense amount of development is proposed for these areas, including the community center/gymnasium, tennis courts, basketball courts, multi-use sports fields, and the greatest amount of parking. The potential exists for all of these buildings, courts, fields, parking lots and pedestrian areas to collectively visually dominate the NCP and adversely affect the existing rural character. A visual change is inherent with the introduction of these recreational uses into this mostly undeveloped section of the park. It is expected that most viewers will consider additional recreational uses to be a visually appropriate and acceptable condition in this existing park setting if the proposed elements are consistent with the community aesthetic values in terms of rural character and open space. Implementation of the mitigation measures would minimize the visual presence of built structures, courts, paving, earthwork, fields, and lighting, and would emphasize the more natural character of the NCP and the region.

9.1.2 Air Quality (Class III)

The cumulative study area for air quality impacts is the South Central Coast Air Basin (SCCAB). The project would contribute criteria pollutants to the SCCAB during project construction and long-term operational use, including ozone precursors and particulate matter. A number of large development projects are currently under review by the County, including mixed use, residential, and commercial projects in the immediate area. These projects may be under construction simultaneously with certain elements of the project, and in the long-term, would be generating similar air emissions due to increased traffic trips and energy use.

Depending on construction schedules and actual implementation of projects in the area, generation of fugitive dust and pollutant emissions during construction could result in substantial short-term increases in air pollutants. This would be a contribution to short-term cumulative air quality impacts. Analysis conducted specifically for this project concluded that the build-out of the Master Plan would contribute to cumulative long-term operational air quality impacts because it is projected to exceed the daily ROG+NO_x threshold. However, with implementation of mitigation measures, the project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts would be *less than significant* (Class III) and no additional mitigation is necessary.

In addition, the project would provide additional recreational facilities within one to five miles of proposed residential developments within Nipomo, and would be accessible via alternative transportation, including pedestrian walkways and bicycle paths, which may reduce cumulative air emissions in the area.

9.1.3 Biological Resources (Class III)

Several projects are proposed within the immediate area, which would result in the conversion of undeveloped pockets to urbanized uses in the vicinity of NCP. In addition to development within the community of Nipomo, residential subdivisions and other development in the South County area contribute to regional habitat loss, including but not limited to oak woodland, coastal scrub, maritime chaparral, central dune scrub, coastal scrub, and grassland. Impacts to habitat, nesting and foraging sites, and special status species may occur in these locations, and mitigation would be required including pre-construction surveys and revegetation of habitat and oak trees. In addition to the direct effects identified above, build-out of the Master Plan would result in an increase in park visitors, which has the potential to affect natural resources and habitats. The specific impacts resulting from the proposed project would be mitigated to a less than significant level, and the project would not contribute to cumulatively significant impacts. Cumulative impacts would be *less than significant* (Class III). No additional mitigation is required.

9.1.4 Cultural Resources (Class III)

Implementation of the proposed project would potentially contribute to the cumulative degradation of significant cultural resources in the County. The destruction of cultural resources has a significant cumulative impact as they make the study of historic life unavailable for study by scientists. Given the prevalence of cultural resource sites in the Nipomo area, several of the development projects identified in the area likely have an effect on archaeological and historical resources, and require implementation of standard mitigation measures. For the proposed project, impacts to known potential subsurface cultural resources would be avoided or mitigated by implementation of monitoring and documentation, and development would contribute to a significant loss of cultural resources in the area. Based on implementation of mitigation measures recommended in the EIR, potential cumulative impacts resulting from the proposed project are considered *less than significant* (Class III). No additional mitigation is required.

9.1.5 Geology, Soils, and Drainage (Class III)

Implementation of the pending and approved projects listed in the cumulative development scenario would increase development in the immediate area. Additional development, including the proposed project, would increase the number of people and structures exposed to a variety of geologic and soils hazards within the County, including liquefaction and ground shaking. Potential impacts related to geologic, soils, and seismic hazards are all site-specific, and mitigation measures are applied to each project to minimize the potential for significant geologic impacts. All development projects are required to comply with State and local regulations regarding grading and construction; therefore, no cumulative impacts related to these issues have been identified. Implementation of mitigation measures identified in the EIR and compliance with existing regulations would mitigate impacts to less than significant. Based on implementation of mitigation measures recommended in this EIR, potential cumulative impacts resulting from the proposed project are considered *less than significant* (Class III). No additional mitigation is required.

9.1.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Class III)

Potential hazards in the EIR are location-specific to the extent that they may result in significant impacts on the localized environment, but they are not “cumulative” in the sense normally applied in CEQA documents. Further, the impacts identified in this section are associated with relatively short-term construction activities and the continued monitoring of the

known dump site, and anticipated testing and remediation activities at that site will reduce potential exposure to hazards during construction and use of future structures and park facilities. The mitigation measures that have been identified for the proposed project would apply cumulatively as well. Cumulative impacts would be *less than significant* (Class III). No additional mitigation is required.

9.1.7 Noise (Class III)

There are no proposed or recently approved projects in the immediate area that would generate a significant level of stationary noise (including the proposed Master Plan); therefore, cumulative noise impacts related to stationary noise would be less than significant. To determine the cumulative traffic noise level increase, the *Traffic Impact Analysis* (March 2010) was used in order to determine build-out traffic conditions. Expected cumulative transportation-related noise increases are presented in Table 4.8-11. All estimated noise increases have been rounded to one decimal place. Due to the relatively low number of expected additional trips (compared to build-out conditions) estimated noise level increases due to project generated traffic are expected to be negligible (0.0 to 0.1-dB increase). Since the expected noise level increase would be less than 1 dBA, traffic noise impacts are not expected to occur due to traffic generated by traffic buildout and proposed NCP uses. Based on the traffic and noise analysis summarize above, potential cumulative noise impacts related to transportation noise generated by the project would be *less than significant* (Class III) and no additional mitigation is necessary.

9.1.8 Land Use (Class III)

Potential cumulative land use impacts would be avoided or minimized through implementation of the mitigation measures described in the EIR. The proposed uses are generally consistent with the current use of NCP, the surrounding community, and the land use designation and policies applicable to the project site. In addition, prior to development of major features requiring further discretionary review, the public will have an opportunity to provide comments regarding specific elements (i.e., recreation/community center). Potential cumulative impacts resulting from the proposed project are considered *less than significant* (Class III). No additional mitigation is required.

9.1.9 Public Services and Utilities (Class III)

The impacts of the proposed development within the community of Nipomo would contribute to a cumulative effect on public emergency services and responders. Development is subject to public service fees upon permit issuance, which assists such facilities by providing funds for infrastructure and facilities. However, these fees do not address additional staffing. The demand for public and emergency services staff increases with additional growth within the community of Nipomo, and cumulative effect may be significant. Implementation of standard crime prevention measures and coordination with CAL FIRE, the County Sheriff's Department, and CHP reduce the potential for crime and emergencies, and lessens the demand on services. In addition, the project would contribute to the demand for energy, including electricity, gas, and fossil fuels. Implementation of the project accommodates energy conservation in design and operation, and provides alternative transportation opportunities, including improved pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access. Furthermore, the project includes recreational facilities within an existing urban area adjacent to residential areas, which would reduce vehicle miles traveled (and consumption of fuels for vehicle use) within the community of Nipomo.

Based on the location and design of the project, and implementation measures recommended by the County Sheriff's Department and CAL FIRE, the proposed project would not have a cumulatively considerable effect on public services. Potential cumulative impacts resulting from the proposed project are considered *less than significant* (Class III). No additional mitigation is required.

9.1.10 Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic

TR Impact 2	
Buildout of the NCP Master Plan will potentially have a significant cumulative impact at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange southbound ramps during the p.m. peak hour.	
Mitigation	Implement **TR/mm-1**. **TR/mm-2** Upon development of high-traffic generating uses, including tennis courts, sports fields, amphitheater, and community center, a during periodic review of the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan, the General Services Agency shall re-assess the project's effect on the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. a. In the event the project would have a significant traffic impact, the County shall adopt Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures for implementation, as necessary, during peak times (Monday through Friday, 4:00 – 6:00 pm) including, but not be limited to: requiring reservation for specific uses, staggered scheduling of starting times for the sports fields, and limiting the size of community center events. b. County Parks shall coordinate with County Public Works to determine the appropriate South County Road Improvement Fee Area 1 fees at the time development is proposed. In the event South County Road Improvement Fee Area 1 fees are determined to be appropriate by Public Works, in accordance with Title 13.01 of the County Code, the General Services Agency shall provide the fees prior to development of high-traffic generating uses (i.e., tennis courts, sports fields, amphitheater, and community center).
Findings	After implementation of the mitigation measures, the proposed project impacts would be *not significant with mitigation* (Class II).
Supportive Evidence	Buildout daily and peak hour traffic volumes for the local street system serving were obtained from the South County Traffic Model Update (Final Report). The relation between daily and peak hour traffic volumes in the traffic model were used to derive roadway segment and intersection turning movement volumes not included in the final report. Minor adjustments were applied to the p.m. peak hour traffic volumes at the West Tefft Street and Orchard Avenue intersection to reflect for the actual amount of traffic utilizing the library driveway. Data contained in the ITE Trip Generation Manual was referenced to perform the adjustments for p.m. peak hour traffic on the adjacent street system between 4:00 and 6:00 PM. The cumulative buildout volumes for the local street system are illustrated on Figure 4.10-3 (page 4.10-21 in the EIR), and reflect the current uses at the NCP. Table

TR Impact 2	
	4.10-10 (page 4.10-18 in the EIR) shows the levels of service under Cumulative and Cumulative with Project Conditions. Detailed LOS calculation sheets are included in Appendix G in the EIR. Average vehicle delays will be within acceptable limits at the study intersections with the buildout of the NCP Master Plan. Delays on the westbound approach at the Pomeroy Road and Camino Caballo intersection will be within unacceptable limits (LOS E-F). As documented under existing conditions delays at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange southbound ramps are within unacceptable levels (LOS E). Completion of the US 101/Willow Road interchange is anticipated to reduce traffic demands and vehicle delays at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange by about 40% during the PM peak hour. PM peak hour traffic demands will also be reduced on Pomeroy Road and at the Pomeroy Road/Camino Caballo intersection. However, the Willow Road Extension EIR analysis indicates that the benefits associated with the project will not eliminate the adverse LOS at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange during the PM peak hour period. The NCPMP is a 20-year plan; therefore, periodic re-assessment of traffic conditions is recommended prior to development and during operation of high-traffic generating uses to ensure traffic impacts are mitigated to the extent feasible. The re-assessment would include consultation with Public Works to identify impact fees appropriate for the project, based on the most recent South County Traffic Model Update. The associated capital improvement program provides a mechanism for the funding of future long range infrastructure improvements, which would improve traffic and circulation. Proposed facilities and amenities that may trigger the South County Road Improvement Fee (Area 1) include the permanent pre-school and administration building, sports fields, community center, amphitheater, swimming pool, skate park, open turf, playgrounds, dog park, handball courts, horseshoe pits, tennis courts, and basketball courts. While the project would add trips to the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange, periodic re-assessment of the project's effect on traffic flow and delay is recommended to ensure the best application of mitigation prior to development and during operation of major improvements. Recommended mitigation, including implementation of Transportation Demand Management measures, payment of Area 1 fees, and incorporation of a transit stop within NCP (if requested by RTA), would reduce potential cumulative effects related to trip generation to less than significant.

Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic (Class III)

Cumulative Roadway Operations. Cumulative daily traffic volumes on a majority of the study area roadway segments will remain within acceptable limits with the buildout of the NCP

Master Plan (LOS C or better). Cumulative daily traffic along West Tefft Street near the US 101 interchange is projected to be within the LOS E range (with or without the project). Completion of the US 101/Willow Road interchange is anticipated to reduce daily traffic on West Tefft Street (west of US 101) by about 20-25%. The Willow Road Extension EIR analysis indicates that the benefits associated with the project are estimated to improve the buildout LOS E to an acceptable LOS C (27,200 ADT) on West Tefft Street (near US 101 interchange) (refer to page 4.10-20 in the EIR). Therefore, potential cumulative impacts are considered *less than significant* (Class III), and no additional mitigation is required.

9.1.11 Wastewater (Class III)

As proposed, the project would include the development of additional on-site wastewater treatment and disposal systems. The siting and operation of the systems would comply with the Basin Plan, and would therefore have no adverse effect on surface or groundwater, or the NCSD community system. Therefore, the project would not contribute to the cumulative impacts related to wastewater, resulting in a *less than significant impact* (Class III), and no additional mitigation is required.

9.1.12 Water Resources

The NCP is currently one of the largest single customers of the NCSD. Water demand for existing and proposed uses would represent a measurable quantity of annual distribution. As previously discussed, the NCSD has available water to serve this project, in addition to others within the service area. In addition, further development of supplemental water, and increased use of recycled water, within the service area will be implemented in the future to reduce demands from NCSD wells. Based on implementation of identified mitigation measures, implementation of the NCP Master Plan, potential cumulative impacts would be *less than significant* (Class II) and no additional mitigation measures are necessary.

9.1.13 Climate Change

No single project is considered large enough to individually affect climate change. GHG impacts, including those described above, all contribute cumulatively with those produced worldwide, to affect climate change. Compliance with identified air quality, energy efficiency, and water conservation mitigation measures would reduce the project's contribution to cumulative GHG emissions, and subsequent climate change. Cumulative effects would be *less than significant* (Class III), and no additional mitigation is required.

9.2 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

The proposed project is identified in local government planning documents. It is proposed to address an existing demand for passive and active recreational uses and parkland within the County, and the community of Nipomo. The project would not create new jobs or require additional housing. Given its relatively small scale and limited function, the proposed project would not be considered growth-inducing. Impacts would be *less than significant* (Class III), and no mitigaiton is required.

10.0 ALTERNATIVES

CEQA, §15126.6(a), requires an EIR to "describe a reasonable range of alternatives to a project, or to the location of a project, which could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives". Through the scoping process, if an alternative was found to be infeasible, as defined above, then it was dropped from further consideration. In addition, CEQA states that alternatives should "…attain most of the basic objectives of the project..." Please refer to Chapter 5, Alternatives Analysis, of the EIR for a detailed discussion of the alternatives. The following alternatives were selected for more detailed review.

10.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

This alternative is required to be considered by CEQA, and would not include implementation of the Master Plan. Implementation of the no project alternative would not preclude development or improvements within the park. The park amenities would continue to operate, and improvements may occur independent of a master development plan.

10.2 ALTERNATIVE MASTER PLANS

10.2.1 Alternative Master Plan A

Alternative Master Plan A proposes approximately 22.7 acres of new facilities and infrastructure and 4 acres of additional open play area (turf) (refer to Table 2).

Implementation of Alternative Master Plan A would result in approximately 38 acres of total developed area, or approximately 23% of the 159-acre park. A community center would be located near West Tefft Street, including a community center, pre-school and administration building, and gymnasium. The remaining additional facilities would be located near the center of the park, including an amphitheater, basketball and tennis courts, a pool or skate park, multi-use sports fields, playground, open lawn area, horseshoe pits, off-leash dog park, gazebo/informational stage, and infrastructure improvements. A lawn area and play structure is proposed near Osage Street and Camino Caballo.

Table 2. Master Plan Existing and Proposed Amenities
Alternative Master Plan A

Facilities	Existing (sf)	Proposed (sf)	Total (sf)
Recreation Area			
Amphitheaters	0	5,227	5,227
Basketball Courts	0	10,000	10,000
Playgrounds	6,534	8,276	14,810
Community Center	0	14,000	14,000
Dog Parks	31,988	19,000	50,988
Group Picnic Areas	9,433	0	9,433

Exhibit B

Facilities	Existing (sf)	Proposed (sf)	Total (sf)
Handball Courts	0	0	0
Horseshoe Pits	0	1,800	1,800
Skate Park or Swimming Pool	0	10,000	10,000
Sports Fields (Turf)	231,633	439,520	671,153
Tennis Courts	26,404	14,400	40,804
Trails/Walkways (paved/unpaved)	50,724	127,373	178,097
Osage Street Walkway (paved)	0	11,280	11,280
Volleyball Court	0	0	0
Subtotal	*356,716*	*660,876*	*1,017,592*
Open Space			
Open Space (undeveloped)	5,689,881	-1,088,510	4,601,371
Open Play Area (Turf)	399,805	176,498	576,303
Trails (dirt)	190,200	-84,276	105,924
Subtotal	*6,279,886*	*-996,288*	*5,283,598*
Infrastructure			
Basins	54,900	108,900	163,800
Library Building	7,134	4,000	11,134
Parking	137,166 (325 spaces)	183,388 (422 spaces)	320,554 (747 spaces)
Pre-school	4,050 (temporary)	0	4,050 (permanent)
Two Host Sites	1,284	0	1,284
Restrooms/Maintenance Buildings	3,155	1,490	4,645
Roads	89,036	32,234	121,270
Subtotal	*296,725*	*330,012*	*626,737*

10.2.2 Alternative Master Plan B

Alternative Master Plan B was adapted from recommendations by the South County Advisory Council (refer Table 3 below).

This alternative expands on existing uses, and does not include major features identified in the proposed project, such as the community center, sports fields, skate park, or swimming pool.

This alternative accommodates adult fitness equipment within the paved trail system, a small (10,000-square foot) turf and picnic area near the play area, and equestrian staging within the parking areas (similar to the proposed project). Overall parking is reduced relative to the proposed facilities. Road improvement projects, including widening of Osage Road and realignment of the park entrances would be implemented with this project.

Table 3. Master Plan Existing and Proposed Amenities
Alternative Master Plan B

Facilities	Existing (sf)	Proposed (sf)	Total (sf)
Recreation Area			
Amphitheater and Gazebo	0	5,227	5,227
Basketball Courts	0	10,000	10,000
Playgrounds	6,534	8,276	14,810
Community Center	0	0	0
Dog Parks	31,988	0	31,988
Group Picnic Areas	9,433	0	9,433
Handball Courts	0	0	0
Horseshoe Pits	0	1,800	1,800
Skate Park	0	0	0
Sports Fields (Turf)	231,633	0	231,633
Swimming Pool	0	0	0
Tennis Courts	26,404	14,400	40,804
Trails/Walkways (paved/unpaved)	50,724	127,373	178,097
Osage Street Walkway (paved)	0	11,280	11,280
Volleyball Court	0	1,800	1,800
Subtotal	*356,716*	*180,156*	*536,872*
Open Space			
Open Space (undeveloped)	5,689,881	-510,168	5,179,713
Open Play Area (Turf)	399,805	10,000	409,805
Trails (dirt)	190,200	0	190,200
Subtotal	*6,279,886*	*-500,168*	*5,779,718*

Exhibit B

Facilities	Existing (sf)	Proposed (sf)	Total (sf)
Infrastructure			
Basins	54,900	108,900	163,800
Library Building	7,134	4,000	11,134
Parking	137,166	13,200	150,366
Pre-school	4,050	0	4,050
Two Host Sites	1,284	0	1,284
Restrooms/Maintenance Buildings	3,155	1,490	4,645
Roads	89,036	32,234	121,270
Subtotal	*296,725*	*159,824*	*456,549*

10.3 COMMUNITY CENTER ALTERNATIVES

Four alternative locations for the proposed community center, including the structure, parking, and associated landscaping, are qualitatively assessed below. The center would be used for recreation and events (up to 300 persons) for all members of the community.

10.3.1 Community Center Alternative A (Sandydale Drive and Frontage Road)

The location of this alternative site is at the northern terminus of the Frontage Road, at the intersection with Sandydale Drive. This parcel is approximately 4.4 acres, and is within the Commercial Service land use category. The site is currently undeveloped. Surrounding land uses include residential development, the Nipomo Dog and Cat Hospital, a fitness center, and a storage facility. Land to the northwest is undeveloped, and US 101 is located to the east.

10.3.2 Community Center Alternative B (West Tefft Street and Branch)

This site is located at the corner of Burton Street and Mallagh Street, west of West Tefft Street. The parcel is approximately 2.6 acres in size, and is within the Office and Professional land use category. The site is currently undeveloped. Surrounding development includes residential development, the Nipomo Men's Club, and commercial/retail development along West Tefft Street.

10.3.3 Community Center Alternative C (Orchard Avenue and Division Street)

This site is located at the intersection of Orchard Avenue and Division Street. The parcel is approximately 2.85 acres in size, and is within the Commercial Retail land use category. The site is undeveloped. Surrounding land uses include a 76® gas station and the La Placita Market and carwash, a strawberry field and fruit stand, and residential development.

10.3.4 Community Center Alternative D (Hill Street and Grande Street)

This site is located between Hill Street and Grande Street, approximately 500 feet west of the Frontage Road. The parcel is approximately 9.6 acres in size, and is within the Residential Multi-family land use category. A planned unit development and retail development are

proposed to the east, and the property to the west is vacant. Land uses along Grande Street include residences, greenhouses, and San Luis Bay Apartments. Land uses along Hill Street include multi-family residential development and a truck parking area.

10.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires the alternatives section of an EIR to describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the project that avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects identified in the EIR analysis while still attaining most of the basic project objectives. The alternative that most effectively reduces impacts while meeting project objectives should be considered the "environmentally superior alternative." In the event that the No Project Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR is also supposed to identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. In the EIR the No Project Alternative results in the fewest environmental impacts, although it does not meet any of the project objectives.

As proposed, and with the incorporation of mitigation measures, the proposed project would not result in any significant, unavoidable, adverse impacts. Alternative Master Plan A would result in similar impacts as the proposed project. Key changes include the location of larger structures closer to West Tefft Street, as opposed to the interior of the park. Structural development along the road corridor may appear to be more consistent with the visual character of the area, and would maintain a more rural character within the park itself.

Alternative Master Plan B would significantly reduce uses that require water supply exceeding existing demands. This alternative would also not generate traffic trips and air emissions associated with higher demand uses, such as sports fields and open turf. Upon sole consideration of environmental effects, this alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. While this alternative minimizes potentially significant effects related to aesthetics (including the creation of light and glare), air quality, noise, and water supply, it does not fully meet the objectives of the project. Implementation of this alternative would not provide a range of passive and active facilities and use areas to meet the recreational needs of the community, and it would not effectively manage current and projected levels of park uses.

In addition, Alternative Master Plan B would require consideration of an alternative site for the community center for consistency with project objectives. Two potential locations for the proposed community center appear to be environmentally superior: Alternative B, West Branch Street, and Alternative C, Orchard Avenue and Division Street. These locations could be developed with the least amount of ground disturbance, and do not appear to be constrained by sensitive environmental resources. Consideration of noise impacts and the surrounding residential communities may necessitate limits on use (i.e., no events past 10:00 p.m.) and amplified sound (interior use only). Further analysis of biological and cultural resources is recommended. The site between Grande and Hill streets may avoid impacting sensitive land uses.

All alternative locations for the community center under Alternative Master Plan B are potentially inconsistent with the County LUO, primarily related to South County Nipomo Urban Area limitations on use. Alternative B, West Branch Street, is within the Office and Professional land use category; full consistency with the LUO would limit indoor amusement and recreation, and public assembly and entertainment. Alternative C, Orchard Avenue and

Division Street, is within the Commercial Retail land use category, and limited allowable uses do not include public assembly and entertainment.

The County Board of Supervisors has determined that Alternative Master Plan B does not sufficiently meet the project objectives, and is inconsistent with the County's goals and policies. Alternative Master Plan B is therefore rejected. As a result, the proposed project, and Alternative Master Plan A, are the Environmentally Superior Alternatives.

Exhibit B

11.0 MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

PRC § 21081.6 requires the lead agency, when making the findings required by PRC § 21081(1)(a), to adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project that it has adopted, in order to ensure compliance during project implementation. The County is the lead agency responsible for the adoption of the reporting or monitoring program. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) has been prepared that requires the County to monitor mitigation measures designed to reduce or eliminate significant impacts, as well as those mitigation measures designed to further reduce environmental impacts that are less than significant.

The MMRP designates responsibility and anticipated timing for the implementation of mitigation measures within the jurisdiction of the County. Implementation of the mitigation measures specified in the Final EIR and the MMRP will be accomplished through administrative controls over project planning and implementation. Monitoring and enforcement of these measures will be accomplished through verification in periodic Mitigation Monitoring Reports and periodic inspection by appropriate County personnel. The County reserves the right to make amendments to and/or substitutions of mitigation measures if, in the exercise of discretion of the County, it is determined that the amended or substituted mitigation measure will mitigate the identified significant environmental impact to at least the same degree of significance as the original mitigation measure it replaces, or would attain an adopted performance standard for mitigation, and where the amendment or substitution would not result in a new significant impact on the environment that cannot be mitigated.

As lead agency for the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan EIR, the County hereby certifies that the MMRP set forth in Chapter 7 of the Final EIR, which has been designed to ensure compliance during construction of the proposed project and includes all of the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and adopted and incorporated into the project, is adequate to ensure the implementation of the mitigation measures described herein.